Perspectives in American History

No. 6

THE ATTITUDE OF THE NORTHERN CLERGY TOWARD THE SOUTH 1860-1865

THE ATTITUDE OF THE NORTHERN CLERGY TOWARD THE SOUTH
1860-1865

By
CHESTER FORRESTER DUNHAM

PORCUPINE PRESS
Philadelphia 1974

E
540
C5D8
1974

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Dunham, Chester Forrester, 1891-1959.
The attitude of the Northern clergy toward the South, 1860-1865.

(Perspectives in American history, no. 6)
Originally presented as the author's thesis, University of Chicago, 1939.
Reprint of the 1942 ed. published by the Gray Co., Toledo, Ohio.
Bibliography: p.
1. United States--History--Civil War--Religious aspects. 2. Southern States--Civilization.
3. Clergy--United States. I. Title. II. Series: Perspectives in American history (Philadelphia) no. 6.
E540.C5D8 1974 973.7'152 73-16330
ISBN 0-87991-337-1

First edition 1942
(Toledo, Ohio: The Gray Company, Publishers, 1942)

Reprinted 1974 by
PORCUPINE PRESS, INC.
1317 Filbert St.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Manufactured in the United States of America

TO
CHESTER GRAY DUNHAM
RICHARD MARSHALL DUNHAM

345894

PREFACE

THIS clerico-political study seeks to discover the mind of the Northern Clergy: their ideas, opinions, convictions and attitudes toward the South from 1860 through 1865, and incidentally during the decade of the fifties. The "sample" method is employed: the presentation of a wide variety of typical attitudes, illustrating the cross section of the clerical mind. There is an abundance of historical evidence in the form of printed sermons, religious newspapers, and magazines, as well as comments in the secular press to afford an adequate portrayal of the main and minor currents of clerical thought.

As leaders in a realm of public opinion and of human emotions, the resultant attitudes will suggest, in a measure, the position of the clergy and their influence and significance in the support of the North and the defeat of the South. Whether they led public opinion, prodding the State to take more advanced positions in policy and action, or were dutiful reflectors of national projects, or co-operators in an interplay of factors, will not always be easy to appraise.

In the last analysis, the emergent clerical attitudes toward peace-time opponents, or war-time enemies, or reconstructionist antagonists, will reveal the Christian Way of Life as interpreted and exemplified by the Northern Clergy.

We owe grateful acknowledgment to Professors Bessie L. Pierce, J. Fred Rippy, and William T. Hutchinson for their vital evaluation, and especially to Professor Avery O. Craven, whose penetrative, sympathetic, and inspiring counsel has followed this study from its inception to its conclusion. Appreciation is due Dean Jessie A. Caughey for her constructive comment and the librarians and their aides of the more than thirty institutional archives from New York to Chicago who have been uniformly co-operative in securing research materials.

We thank the following publishers for their courtesy in granting permission to quote from their books of which they control the copyright:

Harper & Brothers, *The Story of Religions in America,* by W. W. Sweet, and *The March of Faith,* by W. E. Garrison.

Houghton, Mifflin Company, *The Eve of Conflict,* by G. F. Milton. (Pages 167-168: Congressional Globe, 33rd Cong. 1st Session, App., 636,617 et seq.)

Liveright Publishing Corporation, *Abraham Lincoln,* by Emanuel Hertz.

"THE TRIAL OF WAR"

"War is a conflict of ideas, and can such conflict be avoided so long as good and evil are permitted to confront each other?"

The Gospel Messenger and Church Record of Western New York (Episcopalian), XXXV, No. 41, 162 (October 17th, 1861).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter *Page*

I. Introductory: The Clergy and Politics 1
The Position and Influence of the Clergy
The Christian Religion and American Politics
Slave Security and the Compromise of 1850

II. The Clergy and the Rising Tide of Social Action 35
The Ideology of Anti-Slavery Conviction
Dramatic Fiction and Harriet Beecher Stowe
The Lash of the Gutta Percha Cane
Squatter Sovereignty and Stephen A. Douglas
Slavery Nationalization and Dred Scott
Direct Action and John Brown
The Ballot and Political Secession

III. The Clergy and the Southern Way of Life 81
Divergent Civilizations of North and South
The Southern Social Order of Caste
The Southern Barbarous Slavocracy
The Apostate Religion of the South
Northern Clerical Apologists

IV. The Clergy and the Holy Crusade of the Southland ... 110
Christianity and War
The Causes of the War
The Loyalty of the Northern Clergy
The Disloyalty of the Northern Clergy
Southern Atrocities Culminating in Assassination
The Northern Objectives of the Conflict

V. The Clergy and War Guilt and Peace Terms 165
Conciliation or Condemnation
The Iniquity and Damnation of John Wilkes Booth
The Guilt and Sentence of Jefferson Davis
The Responsibility and Future of Robert E. Lee
The Destiny of Other Southern Leaders
The Deceived Masses of the South
The False Prophets of Christendom
Peace Terms

VI. The Clergy As Architects of a New South 204
The Need of Religious Reconstruction
Plans of Spiritual Regeneration
Projected Programs for a New South
Northern Prophets of Idealism and Realism

Conclusions 238

Bibliography 241

Index 254

CHAPTER I

The Clergy and Politics

The Position and Influence of the Clergy

"THEY are making the blood of the people boil with indignation," declared the editor of a Universalist magazine of Boston referring to the animosity of the Northern clergy toward the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850.[1] "Members of the different religious denominations," he continued, "catch the spirit of their clergymen."[2] He further observed that the religious journals "speak out very decidedly against this law" and that "these affect in a very high degree the public mind."[3] The result of this furor was the arousing of "a spirit in New England, which has scarcely been parallelled since the times of 1770 and 1775. . . . ."[4]

Equally significant were the words of Senator John C. Calhoun in 1850 in his last famous speech entitled "Slavery."

> The cords that bind the states together are not only many, but various in character. Among them, some are spiritual or ecclesiastical. . . . . The strongest of those of a spiritual and ecclesiastical nature consisted in the unity of the great denominations. . . . . The strong ties which held each denomination together; . . . . powerful as they were, they have not been able to resist the explosive effect of slavery agitation. The first of these cords which snapped under its explosive force was the powerful Methodist Episcopal Church. The numerous and strong ties which held it together are all broken, and its unity gone. . . . . The next cord that snapped was that of the Baptists, one of the largest and most respectable denominations; that of the Presbyterians is not entirely snapped, but some of its strands have given away; that of the Episcopal Church is the only one of the four great Protes-

[1] *The Trumpet and Universalist Magazine* (Boston), XXIII, No. 19, 74.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.*

> tant denominations which remains unbroken and entire. . . . . If the agitation goes on, the same force acting with increased intensity, as has been shown, there will be nothing to hold the states together except force. . . . .[5]

The obvious suggestion that religious unity was basic to that of political integrity implied the power of clerical leadership in the realm of social agitation.

A few weeks prior to his death in 1852, Senator Henry Clay reinforced the apprehensions of Senator Calhoun in an interview with the Rev. Dr. W. W. Hill, editor of the *Presbyterian Herald* of Louisville, and an unnamed Methodist minister.

> I tell you this sundering of the religious ties which have hitherto bound our people together, I consider the greatest source of danger to our country. If our religious men cannot live together in peace, what can be expected of us politicians, very few of whom profess to be governed by the great principles of love? If all the Churches divide on the subject of slavery, there will be nothing left to bind our people together but trade and commerce. . . . . That is a very powerful bond, I admit, but when the people of these states become thoroughly alienated from each other, and get their passions aroused, they are not apt to stop and consider what is to their interest. . . . . If you preachers will only keep the Churches from running into excesses and fanaticism, I think the politicians can control the masses. But yours is the hardest task, and if you do not perform it we will not be able to do our part. That I consider to be the greatest source of danger to our country.[6]

This noted western leader, so powerful for many years past, frankly placed the future of the nation in the hands of the clergy, in their ability to mold the ideas and ideals of their congregations and communities, and to restrain rampant emotionalism.

That clerical thought winged its way to the remote rural frontier was clearly revealed by Major J. B. Pond, the well known lyceum promoter. In his youth in the forties on the Wisconsin frontier, the names of Lyman Beecher, Theodore Parker, and Charles G. Finney were as familiar as those of his

[5]Thomas B. Reed, ed., *Modern Eloquence* (Philadelphia: John D. Morris & Co., 1903), XII 470-72.

[6]*Presbyterian Herald* (Louisville), XXIX, No. 27, 2.

own relatives. In the fifties the "stars" of the lecture platform included such clergymen as Theodore Parker, Henry Ward and Edward Beecher, Edward Everett Hale, Robert Collyer, and Bishop Matthew Simpson.[7] The war intensified the power of the lyceum lecturer, in many instances a minister, and religious institutions were supporters of the American Lyceum from its inception.[8]

The power of the pulpit, the capacity of the church, and the resources of religion were set forth in the early fifties in the *New York Baptist Register* of Utica in an optimistic editorial entitled "Our Defense in the Midst of Danger." In spite of the glaring evils of the times, the editor was firmly convinced that the pulpits of Christendom constituted the fundamental line of defense.

> The most casual observer must see the elements of an alarming character are at work in our country. Our Slavery—Intemperance—Infidelity, and the Man of Sin laying his hands upon our cherished institutions, should awaken fearful apprehensions. But we are not in despair. . . . . The twenty thousand evangelical pulpits of this country constitute a tower of strength. . . . . The existence and labors of Christian Churches, also, have an inconceivable influence not only upon the particular places where they are located, but upon the country at large. The church, with her Sabbaths kept holy to the Lord,—with her Sabbath-schools where multitudes of the young are instructed by pious men and women—with her family altars scattered all over the land—with her Bibles and tracts like the leaves of autumn, constitutes a rock of defense for our country.[9]

The national importance of the Christian pulpit was stressed by the editor of the *Christian Inquirer* (Unitarian) of New York City in 1854. He declared: "The pulpit inasmuch as it is a very important agency in forming public religious sentiment, should have a voice upon all great public questions having a moral and religious bearing. . . . ."[10]

Dr. Washington Gladden, for years the Minister of the First Congregational Church of Columbus, Ohio, one of the leaders in

[7] J. B. Pond, *Eccentricities of Genius* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1901), p. 39.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 551.
[9] XXX, No. 14, 54.
[10] IX, No. 2, 2.

the Social Gospel movement in America, was in 1860 a young New York State pastor, recently ordained, and called to the pastorate of a small church at Morrisania, where he served during the war. He recorded his impressions of the Thanksgiving service of 1860, at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn with Dr. Henry Ward Beecher preaching upon national issues upon the theme: "Against a Compromise of Principles." Mr. Gladden observed that he had "never been in any orderly assembly in which there were more signs of intense feeling."[11] With the implied permission of Mr. Beecher, the "Sunday decorum" was dispensed with, and his address was then "punctuated with vociferous applause."[12] It was a scene "long to be remembered."[13] Mr. Gladden read the *Independent* in those days, followed the leadership of Beecher, Cheever and Thompson, and termed Beecher a "star of the first magnitude" with Storrs, Cuyler, and Bartlett, "shining lights" of the clerical firmament.[14]

The tremendous power of Dr. Beecher was further graphically portrayed by Major J. B. Pond, who asserted that this clergyman's

> position during and after the Civil War reached the altitude of world influence. His command of Plymouth pulpit was the most enormous mental leverage. Theodore Parker said of it as early as 1856, that its 'sounding board was the Rocky Mountains'—the auditorium therefore was the continent. . . . .[15]

Another outstanding pulpiteer of the civil war era was Bishop Matthew Simpson of the Methodist Episcopal Church, ex-president of Depauw (Indiana Asbury) University, former editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, of Cincinnati, and the minister who officiated at the Lincoln Memorial Services at Springfield, Illinois. He was an apostle of patriotism, wielding a profound influence over a congregation or an audience. His biographer, George R. Crooks, affirmed that "usually one short hour gave him the mastery over all who listened to the sound

[11] *Recollections* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1909), pp. 98-100.
[12] *Ibid.*
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 63-89.
[15] *Eccentricities of Genius* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1901), p. 1.

of his voice."[16] An Ohio minister who heard him deliver his famous address on "The State of the Country" during wartime described the climax: "We could see him holding up the tattered flag and addressing it. The effect was electrical. . . . ."[17] Matthew Simpson and Henry Ward Beecher were two supreme examples of clerical might. The Methodist Episcopal and Congregational Churches possessed other oratorical giants. Likewise other denominations boasted their master pulpiteers and lecturers, and from the leading city sacred desk to the humble rural pulpit, each minister had his own circle of church and community friends, over whom he exerted a moral and spiritual control.

Albert Barnes, a contemporary historian, paid a high compliment to religion and the clergy in his study of *The Church and Slavery,* published in 1857. He wrote:

> In a country so extensively under the influence of religion as ours; where religion undeniably so much controls public sentiment; where so large a portion of the community is connected with the church; and where the Christian Ministry exerts so wide an influence on the public mind, it cannot be an unimportant question what the church is doing, and what it ought to do, in reference to an evil (slavery) so vast, and so perilous to all our institutions.[18] . . . . In our country there is no class of men who exert more influence than the ministers of the gospel. . . . .[19]

The position and influence of the clergy is also revealed in the large number of students in colleges and theological seminaries preparing for the ministry and the foreign mission field, in the clerical leadership of denominational colleges, in the home missionary work on the American frontier, in the increasing interest in such social problems as slavery and intemperance, in the growth of church membership, in the creation of new denominations, in the establishment of Sunday Schools, in the church news in the secular press, and in the large number of religious journals directed by clerical editors.

The ideas, ideals and attitudes of the clergy are discovered

[16] *The Life of Bishop Matthew Simpson of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1891). pp. 377-78.
[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 378-79.
[18] (Philadelphia: Parry and McMillan, 1857), p. 10.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

in the pulpit sermon and the Sunday School lesson; the editorial, article, correspondence, and sermon in the religious periodicals; the tract; the denominational resolution or official statement of support or protest; and the activities of the ministry in the reform movements.

While the clergy may be roughly classified into three more or less overlapping groups, the city clergyman, the town minister, and the country pastor, it is very difficult to discover and appraise the influence of the rural religious leader. In many respects in spite of the oncoming trends of urbanization, the North was fundamentally rural, and to a great extent the pastor in the countryside crossroads, small village, or county seat town, exerted as great if not a greater personal influence than did his more conspicuous and better known metropolitan clerical brother. Other things being equal, the sermonic ideas of urban ministers are more apt to be preserved than those of rural pastors, through private publication and distribution at the request of the urban church, through the religious and secular press, and through the publishing of sermonic volumes or mention of the same in biographies.

A clerical influence, second only to that of the pulpit, was the religious press. The significance of religious journalism is portrayed in the number of such periodicals and their circulation. The Christian denomination claims the honor of establishing the first religious newspaper in the United States, the *Herald of Gospel Liberty,* the first issue of which appeared in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, September 1, 1808.[20] During the next two decades there was a rapid increase in the number of journals and their circulation. Before 1826 the *Boston Record, Telegraph,* and *Zion's Herald* had each a circulation of five thousand copies a week, while the *Watchman,* the *Christian Register* and the *Universalist Magazine,* each printed a thousand copies weekly. In 1828 there were thirty-seven religious periodicals serving American Christianity, the largest being the *Christian Advocate* (Methodist) claiming, with its fifteen thousand circulation the world's largest, surpassing even that of the *London Times.*[21]

[20] J. P. Barrett (ed.), *The Centennial of Religious Journalism* (Dayton: Christian Publishing Association, 1908), p. 14.

[21] J. B. McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States* (8 vols.; New York: D. Appleton, 1900), V, 274-75.

In 1850 the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate,* (Methodist) of Cincinnati, stated:

> Thirty years ago there was scarcely a religious newspaper in existence. . . . . Now, how changed is the scene. Each Church has its organs, through which religious intelligence is communicated, and its enterprises advocated, and its triumphs made known.[22]

In 1853 the *New York Baptist and Register* of Utica asserted that it addressed "more than thirty thousand readers every week. . . . ."[23] *The Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York City decreased in circulation from 29,000 copies in 1860 to 26,500 in 1864, while the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati increased from 31,000 in 1860 to 33,787 in 1864, and the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* of the same denomination, located in Chicago, rose from 13,300 copies in 1860 to 25,000 in 1864. The official publications of the Methodist Episcopal Church (North) in 1860 totaled more than four hundred thousand subscribers.[24]

Dr. W. E. Garrison has noted more than four hundred religious journals in the United States in 1870, and has estimated that there were probably three hundred in 1865, appending the appraisal that "in both the number of periodicals and in circulation, the religious press had shown more increase during the twenty years preceding than had the secular press. The religious papers, were, in fact, just coming into their golden age so far as circulation and influence were concerned. . . . ."[25]

Through the editorial columns of the *Congregational Herald* in 1853, the importance of the religious journal was comprehensively set forth.

> . . . . next to the pulpit is the Religious Newspaper to be ranked, unquestionably, in the moral sphere that it is adapted to exert. . . . . Entering week, after week, both the dwellings of the rich and poor; and bearing on its pages the intelligence of the moral condition and wants of the world; heralding the triumphs of the Gospel, and recording the progress of measures of philanthropy; urging the claims of benevolence and duty; mingling consolation for afflicted, with lessons of instruction for old and young;

[22] XVII, No. 39, 154.

[23] XXXIX, No. 27, 106.

[24] W. W. Sweet, *The Methodist Episcopal Church and the Civil War* (Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1912), p. 111.

[25] *The March of Faith* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1933), p. 10.

> rebuking vice and wrong; and inculcating social and moral virtues; inspiring the family with a love of reading, and promoting enlarged views of Christian effort, and reiterating over and over again the lessons taught on the Sabbath from the Sacred Desk, what a mighty and what a blessed influence must it exert wherever it goes.[26]

In the mid-fifties the editor of the same religious journal expressed the opinion that the readers of the ecclesiastical press of the nation embraced the bulk of the intelligentsia.[27]

In 1854 the editor of the *Presbyterian* (Old School), of Philadelphia, described the unique value of the religious press in these words:

> In many cases, the religious newspaper is the only channel of communication with the world at large. Not a few families rely upon it entirely for their secular as well as their religious information. . . . . It is not simply taken up, hastily run over, and then thrown aside for waste paper, it is returned to again and again, until every article, even the advertisements, has been pored over; it passes into the hands of every member of the family, undergoing in each case, perhaps, a similar process. It is referred to in the conversations of friends and neighbors; its opinions and statements are quoted; in fact, it comes at last to be regarded as a sort of living companion, and as an old and reliable friend. With some, too, it takes the place of books, where books would seldom or never reach them. . . . .[28]

The historian James Ford Rhodes observed that

> the religious journal was generally published to reach the bulk of its readers on Saturday, that the subjects it discussed might be read and pondered in the quiet hours of the Sabbath. Its arguments received, therefore, the most careful attention. . . . .[29]

The editor of the *Christian Times* (Baptist) of Chicago frankly stated the function of his sheet in terms of the state of the nation as well as the church. His purpose was

> To adapt himself to the existing conditions of public affairs, both in the religious and political world. His

[26](Chicago), I, No. 3, 2.

[27]*Ibid.*, III, No. 50, 2. ". . . . . the circle of readers also of our religious papers taken together embraces a large share of the best educated and the most intelligent people of the land. . . . . "

[28]XXIV, No. 44, 174.

[29]*History of the United States from the Compromise of* 1850, II (New York: Macmillan, 1892), p. 167.

> readers look to the columns of his paper for information, and often for decided opinions upon all the important topics of the day. . . . . he is not to be in the popular sense a politician, yet, political questions often involve the greatest and most momentous ones. . . . .[30]

Churches, clergymen, and religious papers divided upon the objective of religion, whether it was solely the ideal of salvation of souls for an other-worldly heaven, or whether it also included the building of a heaven on earth through the solution of political, economic, and social problems.

What, then, was the position and influence of the Clergy in the era of the coming of and duration of the war between the States? Three writers well summarize the answer.

The editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (1854): "Ministers are men to whom this Government owes more than it does to any other class. They are men who are ready to plead and fight for liberty, and, if need be, to spill their blood for liberty."[31]

J. N. Davis in an article, *"The Clergy and the Rebellion,"* published in 1862 in the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York, elaborated the central theme that "though the clergy of this country are not politicians, they do, notwithstanding, exert a most powerful influence upon most of the great questions of this age. . . . ."[32]

Rhodes noted significantly that "preachers and speakers had great influence in 1865 in leading public sentiment and that they also in a manner represented it. . . . ."[33]

In round numbers, what in terms of church growth was the appraisal of clerical leadership in the two decades from 1850 to 1870? In 1850 the approximate population of the United States was twenty-three million; the church membership, six million; and the value of ecclesiastical property, eighty-seven million dollars. In 1870 the population was thirty-eight million, the church constituency eleven million, and the church property three hundred and fifty-four millions of dollars. Thus there was an increase of eighty-four per cent in church membership in

[30] IV, No. 1, 2.
[31] (Cincinnati), XXI, No. 21, 82.
[32] XXXVII, No. 24, 186.
[33] *History of the United States from the Compromise of* 1850, V (New York: Macmillan, 1904), p. 154.

comparison with sixty-five per cent in the population of the fifties and sixties.[34]

Therefore the Christian Clergy incarnated an outstanding trained articulate group in the nation, leaders in the realm of moral ideals and fervent emotions, and exponents of an effective gospel, affirmative or negative, as their consciences dictated. Truly they could make "the blood of the people boil with indignation" as they shared their own kindled attitudes.

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND AMERICAN POLITICS

Throughout the decade of the fifties and even into the sixties, the Northern Clergy, in pulpit and religious editorial chair, were divided upon the interpretation of Jesus' words: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." Some were bent on saving souls from hell for a heavenly future life. Others were vitally interested in creating a heaven on earth, and in casting hell out of this life. Still others would blend the objectives sought for in this world and the hereafter. The issue at stake was whether or not the Christian message was to deal directly with the problems of secular government and society. Should sermons be preached in Christian pulpits treating political, economic, and social affairs? Did the Christian Gospel include or exclude such themes as the nature of American Government, slavery expansion, and abolition? Did these secular issues contain moral and religious implications?

In 1850 the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati replied in vigorous fashion to the ominous threats of politicians to cease the publication of discussions upon the question of slavery.

> The *Advocate* is a religious paper. . . . . We meddle with no merely political questions. . . . .We stand upon higher ground. We are Christians—we are Christian freemen—and this greater question (slavery) affects us deeply. It is a moral as well as a political question. . . . . The threatening note from aspiring politicians has warned us to let such subjects alone. To all such threats we can only reply, Gentlemen of the political school, you may muzzle the political press if you can, but the religious press shall be free, and for its support we throw ourselves upon the country. . . . .[35]

[34]W. E. Garrison, *The March of Faith* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1933), p. 45.
[35]XVII, No. 18, 70.

The *Advocate* would, therefore, deal with moral political issues, but not non-moral questions of politics. As it saw the issue, slavery was both a moral and a political problem.

In 1854 in the heat of the Kansas-Nebraska turbulence, the editor of the *Christian Times* (Baptist) of Chicago was possibly replying to criticism that his paper had been publishing inappropriate matter, when he wrote: "It is in no sense traveling out of our appropriate sphere when we include among our topics of discussion, those political questions which have moral or religious implications."[36]

He straightway put his theory into practice and asserted: "The measure (Nebraska bill) . . . . has been very justly characterized as disgraceful. . . . ."[37]

In the spring of 1855 slavery had become a permitted pulpit topic observed the Rev. Samuel Pettes, Jr., of the First Congregational Church of Billerica, Massachusetts. But he also noted that while slavery was a welcome theme in some pulpits, the very word slavery was disdained in others.[38]

The clerical interpretation of the slavery question was placed by the Rev. Nathaniel Hall of the First Congregational Church of Dorchester, Massachusetts, upon the higher level of divine truth and Christian principles, far removed from the transitory low level of political views and opinions. These absolute principles included the righteous God, the righteous will and law of God, and opposition to slavery.[39]

The clergy in pulpit and religious press expressed very decided convictions upon social and political questions. Slavery was discussed by the Rev. E. W. Reynolds of Buffalo in 1856 as a moral issue, and therefore immoral in the light of Christian ethics—a subject for pulpit condemnation.[40] During the presidential election of 1856 the editor of the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago electioneered for Fremont as exemplifying ideals of justice, freedom, and right and opposed Buchanan and Fillmore as representatives of terrorism, ruffianism, and slavery.[41] The

[36] I, No. 25, 2.
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] *The Preacher and the Hearer* (Lowell, Massachusetts: B. H. Penhallow, 1855), p. 4.
[39] *Righteousness and the Pulpit* (Boston: Crosby, Nichols, 1855), p. 21.
[40] *Christian Inquirer* (New York), II, No. 1, 1.
[41] IV, No. 23, 2.

reasons given by this editor for his political preference were that since government was a divine institution, and agents of government were ordained of God, the present control of government was in the hands of enemies of truth, right, and God, and should be replaced by God's friends.[42]

But not all ministers discussed social questions from their pulpits or through the columns of their ecclesiastical journals. The editor of the *Daily Commercial Register* of Sandusky, Ohio, in December 1856, chided the clergy for not introducing politics into the pulpit, and virtually preached a sermon on social ethics to Christian ministers. While admitting that some ministers spoke boldly against national sins, he confined his admonition to the timid clergy who claimed that such procedure was inconsistent with their Christian duties. He believed that since intemperance and slavery were similar moral evils, and since the ministers valiantly attacked the former, it was their duty to denounce the latter. He wrote:

> If it be not the duty of the Christian minister to struggle against the spread of so great an evil, whose duty is it? . . . . Christ took a different view of his duty from that of our modern pulpit conservatives, and neither fear nor heaps of gold turned him aside.[43]

A representative of the clergy who dared to defy the slave powers was the Rev. William T. Dwight of the Third Congregational Church of Portland, Maine, who declared his stand on social issues in a sermon in 1857. Temperance and slavery were deemed moral and religious questions to be dealt with by applying the unchangeable divine law to human legislation through clerical initiative.[44]

In the political campaigns of 1858 and 1860, the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago consistently and persistently opposed Senator Douglas. The reasons given for this lack of support in 1858, were Douglas' "malignant attacks on the Northern ministers, his championship of the interests of Slavery, and his most obnoxious measures against freedom."[45] In 1860 the editor again remembered the attack of Douglas on the clerical petition

[42]IV, No. 28, 2.
[43]VI, No. 171, 2.
[44]*The Pulpit in Its Relations to Politics* (Portland, Maine: Francis Blake, 1857), pp. 26-27
[45]VI, No. 27, 2.

against the Kansas-Nebraska Act and concluded that Douglas was "an example of the infatuation and blindness of sin."[46] In June 1860 the *Congregationalist* of Boston reminded the voters in the coming presidential election that it was "not advocating preaching politics, or making religion consist solely in the performance of political duties, but simply urge every Christian to 'carry religion into politics.' "[47] The significance of the approaching election of 1860 as stated by the *Independent* of New York was the determination of Northern or Southern control of the Federal Government with the implication of the security or insecurity of the system of slavery.[48]

The editor of the *Evangelist* (Presbyterian) of New York City made a keen distinction in preaching politics in the ordinary sense and in the Christian sense. In the first instance, such preaching descended to the low level of party strifes, prejudices, and hatreds, while in the second case, it ascended to the divine level of questions of humanity. The Slave Trade was considered one of those human issues.[49]

In March 1861 the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago made the sweeping assertion that an intimate and close relationship had been effected between religion and politics, stating as the reason for this opinion that "political journals of every stripe—Republican, Democratic, Union, and Secession, welcome and publish the utterances of the Christian pulpit on the great issues of the day. . . . ."[50] After the nation had plunged into war, Dr. Henry Ward Beecher in September 1861 surveyed the change in pulpit preaching, which included preaching politics as well as Christ. "The sublimest history of the Church of Christ, I think, within the last twenty-five years, has taken place during the last three or four months," preached Mr. Beecher, "when the ministers of churches have with one accord so far broken away from the shackles that have bound them as to discuss secular topics in the light of the Gospel. . . . ."[51] Mr. Beecher must have been aware that there was also a vigorous minority of pulpit clergymen and clerical journalists who

[46]VIII, No. 11, 2.
[47]XIII, No. 25, 95.
[48]XII, No. 607, 4.
[49]XXXII, No. 1, 1.
[50]VIII, No. 50, 2.
[51]*Sermons* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1868), pp. 183-86.

refused to discuss political, economic, and social issues in their sermons, editorials, and articles.

The Roman Catholic Church in North and South took no official stand upon the state of the Federal Union or the Confederacy with reference to slavery, secession, and war. But as individuals, the higher and lower clergy as well as the laity, took very decided positions, opposing or supporting slavery, rendering aid to the Federal Government or to the Confederacy, approving or disapproving emancipation, and in general, sharing the patriotism of the section. The attitude or attitudes of the Northern Catholic Clergy was fundamentally personal rather than official.

The principal church assemblies, the First and the Second Plenary Councils of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, were held at Baltimore, Maryland, the first in 1852, and the second in 1866. The decrees and pastoral letter of the first council make no reference to slavery, to abolition, or to the South. Without a division in ante-bellum days, and without a schism during the era of conflict, the second council symbolized the unity and harmony of that Christian body in the time of reconstruction in 1866. Then the concern of the Roman Church was for the evangelization of the freedmen; but instead of providing a national plan, the work was left to the individual dioceses, and thus the Catholic conversion of the negro was doomed to failure.[52]

The Pastoral Letter of the Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore in May 1858, signed by three leading prelates of the first Plenary Council, Archbishop Kenrick, Bishop Neumann, and Bishop McGill, treated the slavery question as follows:

> . . . . in the great political struggles that have agitated the country on the subject of domestic slavery . . . . among us there has been no agitation on the subject. Our clergy have wisely abstained from all interference with the judgment of the faithful, which should be free on all questions of polity and social order, within the limits of the doctrine and Law of Christ. . . . . venerable brethren . . . . Do not in any way, identify the interest of our holy faith with the fortunes of any party. . . . .[53]

[52] *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* (Philadelphia), XXXIX, No. 4, 283, 293, 339-44.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 296.

In May 1861 the Pastoral Letter of the Provincial Council of Cincinnati took a similar position.

> While her ministers rightfully feel a deep and abiding interest in all that concerns the welfare of the country, they do not think it their province to enter into the political arena. They leave to ministers of the human sects to discuss from their pulpits and in their ecclesiastical assemblies the very exciting questions which lie at the basis of most of our present and prospective difficulties. Thus while many of the sects have divided into hostile parties on an exciting political issue, the Catholic Church has carefully preserved her unity of spirit in the bond of peace, literally knowing no North, no South, no East and no West. . . . .[54]

At this time Archbishop John Hughes of New York City, perhaps the leading Catholic clergyman of the North stated: "If unhappily, an event which is sometimes alluded to as a possible contingency, namely a division of the country, should ever take place, the Catholics will have no voluntary part in bringing about such a calamity."[55]

Anti-slavery leaders claimed the support of the Roman Catholic Church for their cause. Thaddeus Stevens read in Congress a Pastoral letter of the Bishop of Bordeaux, France, dated Passion Week, 1862. This letter emphasized the unity of the human family as a dogma of the Church, stigmatized black slavery as having its origin in a "cruel bargain condemned by Pius II in 1482, Paul III in 1557, Urban VIII in 1639, Benedict XIV in 1741, and Gregory XVI in 1839." It also quoted the Bishops of the Province of Bordeaux, in council at La Rochelle in 1853, three years after the emancipation of slaves in the French possessions, as having made this declaration, approved by the Holy See: "The Catholic Church has ever deplored the cruel slavery in which a multitude of men are detained, to the detriment of their souls, and has never ceased to labor to remedy so great a calamity."[56]

But in spite of the above letter, which was employed to win converts to the cause of abolition, Bishop Spaulding more

[54] *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* (*Philadelphia*), XXXIX, No. 4., 303.

[55] H. G. Doyle, *Catholicism in the Building of the Nation* (Boston: Continental Press, 1923), p. 168.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 181.

adequately interpreted the attitude of the Roman Church when he stated that the deliberations of that institution exclusively dealt with morals and church discipline, and not political discussions, which were out of place in such gatherings.[57] During the progress of the war the Bishop further declared that the Catholic Church "had nothing to do with the causes which induced the war"[58] and that the war situation would not be discussed save by "daily prayers for the public good, and for the return of peace and prosperity. . . . ."[59]

Archbishop John Hughes of New York City was an excellent interpreter of the position of the Roman Catholic Church during the fifties and sixties, as well as an exponent of the personal position of many Catholic clergy and laity. In 1852 he advised his clergy "to abstain from all interference in politics."[60] He said that the Church was opposed to slavery only in the sense that she is opposed to calamities which she has no power to reverse and that as far as slavery is concerned she held it to be a crime "to reduce men naturally free to a condition of servitude and bondage, as slaves."[61] In treating the problems of secession and the task of the Federal Government, the Archbishop firmly opposed the recognition of the Confederacy or any compromise with States disloyal to the Union Government and said that the Federal Government must establish its rights once again over the entire nation. He believed, however, not in recrimination, but in kindness toward the Southern States when they "were taken one by one. . . . ."[62] In summarizing the war causes, the Northern objectives, and the attitude of Catholics, he asserted that the anti-slavery agitators were chiefly responsible for the strife, that the North fought solely to uphold the Constitution and to defend the government of the United States, and that Catholics fought for those purposes and not for the cause of abolition.[63] In the consideration of Catholic loyalty the Archbishop felt that "the Church and its ministry will not be wanting

[57] *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, XXXIX, No. 4, 295.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

[59] *Ibid.*

[60] Rena Mazyck Andrews, "Archbishop Hughes and the Civil War" (Unpublished thesis, University of Chicago, 1935), p. 40.

[61] J. R. G. Hassard, *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes, D.D.* (New York: D. Appleton, 1865), p. 436.

[62] H. A. Brann, *Most Reverend John Hughes* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1892), pp. 157-60.

[63] R. M. Andrews, "Archbishop Hughes and the Civil War," pp. 58, 59, 71.

in the impending struggle"[64] and that "my notion according to the principles and leadership of my church is, that a man owes his first fidelity to God, his second fidelity to his country, and his third fidelity to his relatives and friends. Country, as I have taught, comes next to God."[65]

But the Prelate indulged in other utterances that virtually placed him in the position of a neutral rather than an ardent patriot. He wrote in May 1861 to a Southern Bishop that he deprecated the assumed necessity for the war and that he had "not interfered by giving encouragement to Catholics to take part in it, or by giving them advice not to do so. . . . ."[66] Even when he represented the United States in a diplomatic mission to Great Britain and France, apparently to persuade those nations to support the North, and refuse recognition to the South, he wrote to Cardinal Barnabo, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, that if any success should attend his mission, "it would redound to the benefits of the Catholics and to the promotion of the interests of the Church. . . . ."[67] He further declared that he informed President Lincoln that if he went to Europe, he would "represent the interests of the South as well as of the North—in short, the interests of all the United States, just the same as if they had never been distracted by the present civil war. . . . ."[68] He deemed himself loyal to the North and a friend of the South.

A similar attitude of apparent religious neutrality was shared by another great Catholic leader, Father James Gibbons, in after years an American Cardinal. Although he was born in Maryland, and served later in New Orleans, he remained loyal to the Union. He took no part in the strife of the age believing that as a follower of Christ "it was his duty to do as much good as possible for all those with whom he came in contact. . . . ."[69]

Two Pastoral Letters of the Roman Church shed further light upon the attitude of that Church toward such social problems as slavery. The Letter of the Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1858 made a careful distinction between Christian

[64] *R. M. Andrews, "Archbishop Hughes and the Civil War,"* pp. 114-15.
[65] *Ibid.*
[66] J. R. G. Hassard, *Hughes* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1892), pp. 438-39.
[67] *Ibid.*, pp. 449-50.
[68] *Ibid.*
[69] J. J. Walsh, *Our American Cardinals* (New York: D. Appleton, 1926), p. 63.

charity, which was heartily approved, and philanthropic theory, which was ignored.[70] The Letter of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866 preferred a different mode of emancipation to the one in vogue.[71]

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States remained an ecclesiastical unit in the fifties, which continued intact when the Confederate States of America were established. Supreme spiritual loyalty was accorded the Roman Pontiff, while unofficial civic loyalty of Catholics was due fundamentally to the government of the section. The Roman Catholic Clergy did not take any noticeable part in the slavery strife. Many of the Clergy were outspoken in their devotion to the Union cause, while probably most of them were silent concerning political and social issues. Because of the apparently negative position of the Roman Church during the fifties and sixties, Protestants often charged the Church and her Clergy with disloyalty. At the close of the war, cordial ecclesiastical relations were speedily resumed.

Shoulder to shoulder with the Roman Catholic branch of Christendom, as an official neutral in the strife and war of the fifties and sixties, stood *the Protestant Episcopal Church.* While there raged for a season an anti-slavery controversy within her ranks, and while many prominent bishops and lower clergy were conspicuous in their support of the Union and their condemnation of the South, still the Church refrained from soiling its message by entering the realm of politics, and many of her officials maintained a position of studied silence or overt sympathy. Thus standing seemingly between a glacier of pacifism and a cauldron of patriotism, the result was a widespread misunderstanding of the Episcopal viewpoint.

The preservation of the unity and harmony of the Church appeared to be the dominant goal of Episcopal leaders. In the weeks of emerging secession in January 1861 a communication to the *Calendar* (Episcopal) of Hartford stressed the assertion that there were no sectional feelings among the Episcopalians North and South that would endanger ecclesiastical unity.[72] In

[70] *Records of ACHS*, XXXIX, No. 4, 278. ".....the Church has effectually procured the mitigation of the evils attached to servitude.....yet she has never disturbed established order or endangered the peace of society, by following theories of philanthropy."

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 280. "We could have wished.....a more gradual system of emancipation could have been adopted, so that they might have been in some measure prepared to make better use of this freedom, than they are likely to do so now."

[72] XVII, No. 835, 1.

the same month the editor of the above paper penned an editorial with the significant title, "Keep the Church United." In case of permanent secession of the Southern States, he would provide an ecclesiastical constitutional amendment to keep the Church undivided.[73] In April 1861 the editor of the *American Quarterly Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register* (Episcopal) of New York City, sought strenuously to keep the Church undivided and unweakened by the mutual consent of North and South in the spirit of the Episcopal bond of brotherhood. The cause of strife was adherence to outward political, not inward moral, reform.[74]

The Rev. Thomas T. Guion, Rector of St. John's Episcopal Church of Brooklyn, in January 1861 shared the ideal of national Episcopal unity and laid the blame of the sectional discord upon "political preaching."[75]

After the sections had resorted to coercion, the preservation of the Constitution and the Federal Government drew the attention of Episcopal clerics, although the ideal of unity was not lost. The editor of the *Gospel Messenger and Church Record of Western New York* of Utica, heartily condemned Southern seceders and Northern fanatics who would riddle the Constitution, which was "worth a vast struggle to preserve. . . . ."[76] The same journal published in May 1861 an article by Bishop C. P. McIlvaine of Ohio who insisted not only upon loyalty to our country and government, but also upon good will and kindness toward the South.[77] In June the above paper agreed with the *Church Journal* (Episcopal) that the established policy of the Church be maintained, the avoidance of all political issues in Church conventions,[78] and no recognition of the principles of secession in either the Church or State.[79] Bishops were considered bishops of dioceses not of States, dioceses not being identified with States nor recognized by States.[80]

[73]XVII, No. 837, 28. " ..... that out Southern brethern may not be cut off from fellowship nor lose the benefits of our present constitutional organization..... We would suggest an amendment to the Constitution by which the ecclesiastical confederacy may be embraced to include all the Dioceses existing within the present territorial limits of the present United States....."

[74]XIV, No. 1, 154-63.

[75]*The Calendar* (Hartford), XVII, No. 839, 44-45.

[76]XXXV, No. 18, 70.

[77]*Ibid.*, p. 69.

[78]*Ibid.*, No. 22, 87.

[79]*Ibid.*, No. 23, 90.

[80]*Ibid.*, No. 25, 98.

In a series of editorials upon the national emergency, published in the months of January, April, May, and June, 1861, in the *Protestant Churchman* (Episcopal) of New York City, the editor, although of Southern birth, was outspoken in his convictions. In January he called for the preservation of the Union and the destruction of secession.[81] In April after the fall of Fort Sumter he demanded the upholding of Federal authority and the overthrow of rebellion.[82] In May he declared slavery a rotten institution, a statement he had not felt free to make before that time.[83] In June he proclaimed his stand for the Union, the National Government, and for human freedom "without one particle of concern whether North or South like it."[84] Clearly there was a distinction between the official stand of the Church and the position of a rector or an Episcopalian clerical editor.

In 1863 the *Evangelist* (Presbyterian) of New York quoted the *Intelligencer's* discussion of the clash between the pro-slavery Bishop John H. Hopkins of Vermont and the anti-slavery Bishop Horatio Potter of New York. The re-publication of a pro-slavery tract written some years before by Bishop Hopkins was the occasion of "The Battle of the Bishops." A protest was signed by Bishop Potter and more than one hundred and fifty of his clergy, repudiating the views of the Vermont prelate.[85]

In 1865 the Methodist editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati) summarized the war position of the Episcopal Church as one in which there were few and rare loyal utterances from their pulpits and conventions although many of their members whole heartedly supported the Union. The reason given for this silence was that patriotism and politics desecrated the House of God.[86]

Bishop Leighton Coleman in his volume on *The Church in America* described more sympathetically the Episcopal stand as one of loyalty for the North, conciliation for the South, and the

[81] XVIII, No. 32, 252.
[82] *Ibid.*, No. 47, 372.
[83] *Ibid.*, No. 51, 404.
[84] XIX, No. 3, 20.
[85] XXXIII, No. 45, 6.
[86] XXXII, No. 42, 332.

clerical avoidance of purely political questions—a stand which gained for the Church public respect and confidence.[87]

Protestant Episcopal official neutrality in the era of slavery strife and civil war, was in some measure modified by the unofficial spiritual inclusion into political affairs by a minority of the clergy in pulpit and press. Officially, however, the Church was unsullied and afforded the opportunity for post-war reunion.

The Lutheran Church, with the possible exception of the independent Franckean Synod of New York State, ignored the slavery question in the decade of the fifties. This was due in part to the dis-united organization of the Church, and also due to the questionability of such procedure in the realm of religion. The Church became articulate when the negro problem was deemed of paramount moral, religious and spiritual importance, and not simply a secular political, economic, and social issue.

Anti-slavery resolutions adopted by the Lutheran clergy and laity at the convention of the independent Franckean Synod of New York State, first introduced this social issue in that denomination June 7, 1838.[88] In the following year attempts failed to inject such discussion in the conventions of the General Synod. Such debate was effectively silenced, no matter being allowed to come to a test vote, until the war year of 1862.[89] But as the years passed, the Franckean Synod became more and more vigorous in its anti-slavery position, and its influence spread to the Pittsburgh Synod which went on record in 1846 against slavery.[90]

In 1851 the Franckean Synod paid its respects to the Fugitive Slave Law in extreme and colorful language: ". . . . the ill-shapen and hydra-headed offspring of bold usurpation and unmitigated cruelty; that has no safeguard in the natural and social rights of man, nor can it find any sanctions in the clear pealing thunders of Sinai, its blazing fires and the Voice of God or in the teachings of Calvary."[91]

When the more than three thousand Protestant Clergymen from New England sent their united protest to Congress against

[87](New York: Jas. Pott, 1895), p. 254.

[88]C. W. Heathcote, *The Lutheran Church and the Civil War* (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1919), pp. 54-55.

[89]*Ibid.*, p. 60.

[90]*Ibid.*, p. 61.

[91]*Ibid.*, p. 62.

the Kansas-Nebraska Bill in 1854, which was received by Senator Douglas and his cohorts by abuse and vilification, the Franckean Synod replied in convention action in 1854: "That while we cherish feelings and sentiments of respect for the many thousand clergymen who charged the moral batteries of righteousness and earnestly protested in the name of humanity and of God against the infamous bill of abominations called the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, we regret the feelings of contempt and indignation the course pursued by Douglas and his compeers to prostrate the ramparts of freedom and to browbeat, vilify, and disfranchise American citizens because of their official relations as ministers of the gospel, thereby proving themselves traitors to liberty and unworthy of the confidence of free men."[92]

In 1854 the Franckean Synod formulated its anti-slavery stand as follows: ". . . . to oppose, arrest, and overthrow this system of despotism, with all its grinding and double-distilled horrors. . . . ."[93]

Meanwhile another Synod had caught the anti-slavery contagion, and in 1852 the Wittenberg Synod of Ohio termed slavery "a great national evil and abomination,"[94] and in 1853 urged that "every minister promote the abolition of American slavery. . . . ."[95]

There were two trends of ecclesiastical development in the Lutheran Church from 1840 to 1860: a tendency to share the religious "psychology" of other Protestant American Communions, and to co-operate in inter-denominational movements and reforms; and a tendency to confine one's ecclesiastical efforts strictly within Lutheran "psychology," and to banish co-operative efforts and reform, a concept termed the confessional idea, which more or less impregnated the Lutheran Synods of the nation. The exception which proved the rule, was the Franckean Synod, a group of fifty churches with 3,216 members in 1850, existing in a hot-bed of non-Lutheran Protestant abolitionism, which gave it a distinctive social outlook among the other Synods.[96]

[92]C. W. Heathcote, *The Lutheran Church and the Cival War*, (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1919), pp. 63-64.

[93]Robert Fortenbaugh, "American Lutheran Synods and Slavery," *The Journal of Religion*, XIII (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933), No. 1, 91.

[94]*Ibid.*, p. 87.

[95]*Ibid.*

[96]*Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

The Lutheran religious press, managed by their clergy, also revealed definite attitudes toward the problem of slavery.

Conspicuous silence, complete neutrality, and the absolute ignoring of social and political issues as a matter of pride and gratification, appeared to be the position of the outstanding denominational journal, the *Lutheran Observer,* toward abolition, anti-slavery, the Fugitive Slave Law, Brooks' attack on Sumner, and allied topics. In December 1850 the editorial position states: "Our readers, however, need not fear that we are going to agitate the turbid and muddy streams of abolition or slavery. We have never done this, nor allowed others to do it in our columns, nor do we intend. . . . ."[97] The editor consistently took his stand with reference to the Fugitive Slave Law counseling: "Never while we live shall resistance to law breathe from our lips or drop from our pen. . . . . We have no fear of a few rash disunionists, either North or South. . . . ."[98] In commenting upon the assault upon Sumner by Brooks, the editor was scrupulously neutral: "We did not so much as even allude to slavery, or Southern interests; in fact they did not enter into our mind."[99] A change of editors occurred in 1858, but the same policy of silence was continued. The report of the Harper's Ferry uprising was primarily a factual news story without editorial comment.[100] In December 1860 the position of the paper toward social agitation was well summarized: "Thus far, our Church has not been distracted, the subject of slavery having been properly excluded from our ecclesiastical councils; but whether this will be possible hereafter is exceedingly doubtful."[101] The editor saw the handwriting on the walls of America.

But there was a vigorous dissent to this policy of silence in the form of William Passavant, hater of slavery, editor of the *Missionary,* a sheet which served English speaking Lutherans of Western Pennsylvania. He wrote in 1857: "Silence is simply an impossibility; if the Church will not speak, Slavery will."[102]

Der Lutheraner, the official organ of the Missouri Synod, made but a single reference to slavery—that the Tract Society did not print anti-slavery matter because the pocket-book nerve would be touched.[103]

[97] *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (Gettysburg), VIII, No. 2, 160.
[98] *Ibid.*
[99] *Ibid.*, p. 162.
[100] *Ibid.*, p. 164.
[101] *Ibid.*, p. 165.
[102] *Ibid.*, p. 166.
[103] *Ibid.*, p. 171.

No slavery comment was published in the *Lutheran Standard* of the Joint Synod of Ohio, the *Kirchen-blatt* of the Synod of Iowa, or the *Kirchlichen Informatorium* of the Buffalo Synod.[104]

Believing that a schism in the Lutheran Synods, North and South would be averted, and that the political differences of the nation would be settled without war, the scheduled convention to be held at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in May 1861 was postponed a year. The *Lutheran Observer* approved this action:

> This act on the part of the officers will meet with cordial approbation of the Church generally. But few of the delegates could have attended; and in the present condition of affairs the various interests of the Church could not have received that calm deliberation which ought always to characterize the deliberations of ecclesiastical bodies.[105]

A delegate, however, sent a letter of protest to the *Observer*, stating that: "The Synod should have met and prayed to God to roll back the tide of anarchy, and prevent civil war and bloodshed in our beloved land."[106] The editor continued to hope for unity in spite of impending war: "The deplorable conflict which disturbs our nation cannot alter or modify the doctrines or usages of the Church, and our hopes of the Church demand a continued and vital union of all her parts and sections."[107]

Desperately seeking to avert a denominational break, a group of Northern and Southern pastors conferred on the national emergency. The editor of the *Lutheran Observer* made a hasty trip Southward to counsel conservatives and radicals.[108]

In January of 1861, the *Lutheran Standard* took this position concerning the national situation.

> With the discussion of the political questions which have produced the present alarming state of public affairs we have nothing to do. From a Christian stand-point, however, it is our privilege, and now our duty to take a calm view of the crisis which is upon us, and give our counsel that, whatever the issue may be, Christian counsel may in the end prevail. . . . . We believe we may safely say that there is no good and justifiable ground for the bitterness which exists between the different sections of our country. . . . . Is it, however, too late for the Christian sentiment of the people to arouse itself and

[104] *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (Gettysburg), VIII, No. 2, 171.
[105] Heathcote, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
[106] *Ibid.*
[107] *Ibid.*
[108] *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

> stay the process of disintegration which is making such rapid strides among us? . . . . If Christian patriotism of the country is not sufficient in the providence of God to keep us a united people, and it seemeth best unto Him, and for us to separate into two or more distinct confederacies, let us unite in our prayers for a peaceful solution of the difficulties which will be sure to arise in the process of separation. Socially, politically, and morally, civil war is only to be deprecated.[109]

But in spite of all efforts to preserve the unity of the Lutheran Church, two months after the deluge of animosities, in June 1861, there was a Lutheran Church in the South, divorced from that of the North.[110]

The Missionary of Pittsburgh in May 1861 felt that it was high time to "speak out" concerning the state of the union.

> The idea of some persons, that the Christian ought to keep silence at a time like this, when the very existence of government is threatened and every interest of humanity and religion is at stake, is simply an absurdity. Government is an ordinance of God, so much so as the most positive institutions of religion, and both Christ and the apostles have illustrated and enforced our duty in relation to it.[111]

The various synods agreed with the outspoken editor of the *Missionary* for then there poured forth a flood of resolutions in support of the Government, Union, and Constitution, from such bodies as the Franckean Synod, the East Ohio Synod, the New York Ministerium, and the East Pennsylvania Synod.[112]

The postponed General Synod Convention was held in May 1862, in Lancaster with one hundred and ten delegates present, a Tennessee delegate being the only one from south of the Mason and Dixon line. The Federal Government was accorded unanimous support. There was a heated debate regarding a resolution proposing a constitutional emancipation of slavery. Dr. T. Stork of Pennsylvania declared: "It was a virtual endorsement of slavery. It recognized that he (the slave) is a chattel, by saying that the owner may be compensated, in that the negro might go free. . . . ." In spite of some such ethical objections the resolution was passed.[113]

[109]Heathcote, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
[110]*Ibid.*, p. 67.
[111]*Ibid.*, p. 71.
[112]*Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.
[113]*Ibid.*, pp. 74-77.

The Missionary in evaluating the resolutions that had been approved virtually summarized the climactic change in the "national policy" of the Lutheran Church.

> . . . . they put our General Synod, and through it our Church in the true attitude to the great question of the hour. . . . . Our Stars and Stripes are very glorious. . . . . Shall this glorious standard be the unspotted symbol of freedom or be converted into a rag to hide and bandage the running ulcer of slavery? On this point our General Synod has spoken firmly and moderately, and has demonstrated that its long silence gave no consent to the system of slavery; that if it gave proof that it loved erring brethren too well to love altogether wisely, it nevertheless did not love the wrong itself.[114]

The action of the General Synod was approved by all Synods save the Wittenberg, which met in August 1862. The disapproval centered around the "slavery resolution" which these opponents believed to be "incendiary, fanatical, and unwise, and as calculated to stir up strife and division, and so retard the progress of righteousness and truth, as contemplated in the whole work of redemption."[115]

We have dealt at considerable length with three outstanding churches, the Roman Catholic, the Protestant Episcopal, and the Lutheran, whose position during the fifties upon social issues, was virtual silence, although during the Civil War the first two consistently remained mute, while the Lutheran Church changed its position. During the fifteen years from 1850 to 1865 the Clergy of these three Churches were not the leading exponents of social agitation. It will be unnecessary to discuss in detail the attitude of the Baptist, Congregational, Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, Unitarian, and Universalist Churches concerning politics, the slavery issue, and the Civil War. These were the denominations that provided the Northern Clergy, who were the leaders of the anti-slavery movement, the supporters of war, and the adherents of a dynamic policy of reconstruction. Possibly the three most active clerical areas of social action were Boston, Cincinnati, and Chicago, with other important centers as New York City and Philadelphia. Our study considers not the attitudes and positions of all the various denominations

[114]Heathcote, *op cit.*, p. 78.

[115]*Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.

—each one would complete a volume in itself—but rather the attitudes and opinions of individual clergymen.

That there were vigorous ministers from these churches who dissented from "entering politics" or "from dragging religion and the pulpit into politics" is obvious. The evidence tends to suggest that these conscientious objectors were in a minority, rather than a majority. Then, again, from 1850 through 1865, the anti-slavery movement expanded, led by the clergy, who wooed more and more Brethren into that movement, consciously, or in unconscious alliance of ideals. The South, in the last analysis, as the home of the slavocracy, the labor system of slavery, and the civilization based upon that peculiar and unique institution, was deemed by the Northern Clerical leaders of slavery purge, the responsible symbol, agent, and propagator of that system. In an understanding of the attitude of the Northern Clergy toward the South during the fifties and sixties, a comprehension must be first attained of the relationship of religion and politics, of Christianity and social and political problems, and of the clergyman and the politician.

SLAVE SECURITY AND THE COMPROMISE OF 1850

In the thirties ominous clouds appeared intermittently upon the religious horizon, dividing upon matters of polity and theology, the Presbyerian denomination into the Old School and New School churches.

In the forties the slavery question forged schisms in both the Methodist Episcopal and Baptist communions. Viewing with concern this Methodist division in 1845, Henry Clay sounded an alarm: "I will not say that such a separation would necessarily produce a dissolution of the political union of these states; but the example would be fraught with imminent danger and in co-operation with other causes unfortunately existing, its tendencies on the stability of the confederacy would be perilous and alarming.[116]

On the other hand, the Congregational, the Protestant Episcopal, the Friends (Quaker), the Lutheran, the Roman Catholic, the Unitarian, and the Universalist denominations entered the era of the fifties as united fellowships. If there were differences of opinion in these groups concerning pro-slavery and anti-

[116]Quoted by J. B. Bassett, *A Short History of the United States* (New York: Macmillan, 1918), p. 472.

slavery issues, they did not rend their constituencies as were the Methodist and Baptist.

The major national emergency that Henry Clay had envisioned had arrived, and five years after his dire prophecy, the "great compromiser" in 1850 tackled the supreme task of harmonizing the sections of the nation.

In March 1850, more than six months before the passage of the Compromise of 1850, the critical state of the union was aptly described in an editorial entitled "The Dissolution of the Union" in the *Christian Chronicle* (Baptist) of Philadelphia. While this editor did not believe that such a calamity would materialize, he, nevertheless, recorded the state of public opinion.

> These are the words which, of late, we everywhere meet. They are heard in the Capital of the Nation, they are the theme of conversation in all walks of life and they meet our eye on the printed page as the weekly or daily journal falls into our hands. . . . .[117]

Then came the Compromise of 1850 and the Fugitive Slave Law, seemingly a final settlement of that volatile problem. But instead of a sedative, the clergy deemed this legislation a charge of dynamite.

The tocsin was sounded September 22, 1850, by the Rev. Theodore Parker (Unitarian) at the Melodeon, in Boston. Preaching upon the theme, "The Function and Place of Conscience in Relation to the Laws of Men," Dr. Parker boldly defied the Fugitive Slave Law:

> I will do all in my power to rescue any fugitive slave from the hands of any officer who attempts to return him to bondage. I will resist him as gently as I know how, but with such strength as I can command; I will ring bells and alarm the town; I will serve as head, as foot, or as hand to any body of serious and earnest men, who will go with me, with no weapons but their hands, in this work. I will do it as readily as I would lift a man out of the water, or pluck him from the teeth of a wolf, or snatch him from the hands of a murderer. . . . . One thing more I think is very plain, that the fugutive has the same natural right to defend himself against the slave-catcher, or his constitutional tool that he has against a murderer or a wolf. . . . .[118]

[117] IV, No. 31, 122.

[118] *The Slave Power:* Sermon X (Boston: American Unitarian Association, no date), pp. 304-305.

The Fugitive Slave Act greatly stimulated the traffic on the Underground Railroad, that system of slave liberation, with main and branch lines extending from the Mason and Dixon line through the middle and eastern states of the North to Canada. Vigilance committees for the protection of escaping slaves were formed in New York City, Philadelphia, Boston, Syracuse, Springfield, and other smaller cities and towns. The Rev. Theodore Parker was chairman of the executive committee of the Vigilance groups, whose function it was "to prevent a fugitive from being arrested, if possible, or to furnish legal aid, and raise every obstacle to his rendition. . . . ."[119] The Vigilance Committees were "employees" of the U.G.R.R. In a group of somewhat over thirty-two hundred operators of this system, at least eighty have been identified as clergymen, who served in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Kansas, Pennsylvania, Iowa, New Hampshire, Maine, New Jersey, Massachusetts, New York and Vermont.

In October and November 1850, Dr. Theodore Parker continued his sledge-hammer blows at the Fugitive Slave Law, vowing that he would nullify that iniquity, in co-operation with any group of decent and serious men, using any method that would not involve the employment of deadly weapons.[120] He stated later that this odious law "was not fit to be kept" because it was wicked and hence forbidden by the law of God. The one cause which may and ought to dissolve the Federal Union would be the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law. Dr. Parker appealed to the "higher law" in these words: "You may make your statutes; an appeal always lies to the higher law, and decisions adverse to that get set aside in the ages. Your statutes cannot hold Him. . . . ."[121]

A wave of clerical protest greeted the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law in many quarters. Thirty New York Methodist pastors of the metropolis, Brooklyn, and Williamsburg, at a ministerial meeting, demanded the absolute repeal of the unrighteous act as a violation of the law of God. The Congregational Association of New York City refused to recognize the law as binding upon American citizens. The Associate Reformed

[119]W. H. Siebert, *The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom* (New York: Macmillan, 1898), p. 90.

[120]*Ibid.*,

[121]Theodore Parker, *The State of the Nation* (Boston: Wm. Crosby & H. P. Nichols, 1851), pp. 27, 33.

Church urged its members to endure the maximum penalties of the law rather than lend it their support. Sixty delegates to the Free-Will Baptist Conference at Providence, Rhode Island, decided to ignore the law as a violation of one's religious duty to God and mankind. The Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church likewise disapproved of the measure.[122]

Pulpits rang out in condemnation of the law. The Rev. William H. Furness (Unitarian) of Philadelphia dubbed it "a fountain of deadly poison, blinding our understandings, hardening our hearts, searing our consciences, falsifying our religious professions, and perilling the salvation of our souls."[123] The Rev. Joseph F. Thompson (Congregationalist) of New York, appealed to his Puritan heritage to defy the law when he declared: "The Puritans suffered the penalties of violating unrighteous laws, rather than sin against God. The fugitive shall have bread, he shall have money, he shall have shelter, though at the cost of fines and imprisonments."[124] The Rev. R. S. Storrs, Jr., (Congregational) of Brooklyn stressed the higher law of God as binding upon the conscience, not upon man-made legislation. He dramatically compared in eternal imagery the command of Christ to help the needy with that of the Fugitive Slave Law parchment. God's law was deemed decisive and unequivocal.[125]

Dr. Henry Ward Beecher of Plymouth Congregational Church, Brooklyn, believed that the return of a fugitive slave was the acme of crimes, comprising every offense that it was possible for one man to commit against another. Before Beecher would lend a hand to return a fugitive slave, he would scrap prayer, humanitarianism, the Bible and God.[126]

A Presbyterian divine of Brooklyn, the Rev. Samuel T. Spear, vigorously refused to return negro fugitives to bondage, nor would he co-operate with others in that traffic. He asserted: "I would sooner die than be its agent. The higher law of eternal right would be in my way, and by its decision I must abide."[127]

Again and again it was the eternal clash of God's law and man-made legislation, of right and wrong, of freedom and slavery. The situation was well epitomized by Dr. George Bar-

[122]Henry Wilson, *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America* (3 vols.: Boston: James R. Osgood, 1874), II, 309-10.
[123]*Ibid.*, p. 310.
[124]*Ibid.*
[125]*Ibid.*, p. 311.
[126]*Ibid.*
[127]*Ibid.*

rell Cheever of the Brooklyn Church of the Pilgrims (Congregational) who said: "Let no man think that peace cometh by concealing sin, or justifying iniquity, or hardening ourselves in oppression, or setting our will and our statutes in rebellion against God's Word. . . . ."[128]

Either God, Christ, Christianity, the Church, and human freedom or Congress, Legislatures, Slavocracy, politicians, and human slavery were right, and these clergymen chose God.

Further many religious bodies passed stinging resolutions against the law. The New England Methodist Episcopal Conference denounced the Fugitive Slave legislation as "anti-Christian," asserting it was the "imperative duty of every man to do all in his power to render it inefficient, and secure its repeal." The Free-will Baptists shared the same conviction. Although the Maine Congregational Conference ignored the issue, the Congregational Association of Massachusetts, the largest in the denomination, resolved: "That to God as supreme Lawgiver, supreme obedience is due, and no law contrary to his, is binding on us."[129] The Methodist Episcopal Conference of Maine was certain that the Fugitive Slave Law conflicted with "the law of God" and was "not to be obeyed." The Maine Baptist Convention went on record stating that this law "contravenes the law of God, and we earnestly recommend patient enduring the consequences of non-compliance, and make every effort for its immediate repeal." The Unitarian Ministerial Conference specifically commended "all who would honor the Christian name to remember those in bonds, as bound with them, to aid their escape, never betray them, and give no countenance to men who would return them to slavery."[130]

Similar resolutions were adopted by denominational groups in Connecticut, New Hampshire, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois.

In October 1850, some weeks after the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, the editor of the *Trumpet and Universalist Magazine* of Boston comprehensively surveyed clerical opinion concerning the legislation both in pulpit and religious press.

> . . . . the new law . . . . unlike any other we have before had, has created a new sore . . . . it has aroused a spirit

[128]Henry Wilson, *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America* (3 vols.; Boston: James R. Osgood, 1874), II, 311.

[129]Austin Willey, *The History of the Antislavery Cause in State and Nation* (Portland, Maine: Brown, Thurston and Hoyt, Fogg & Donham, 1886), pp. 376-77.

[130]*Ibid.*

> in New England, which has scarcely been parallelled since the times of 1770 and 1775. . . . . The clergy of all denominations, in the North, are using their influence to show the people the odiousness of the law. . . . . we know the clergy do have influence in their own circles; and they are making the blood of the people boil with indignation in regard to this matter. Men who have never interfered with the subject of slavery are aroused on this subject; and the members of the different religious denominations catch the spirit of their clergymen. . . . . In addition to all this, the religious periodicals. . . . . speak out very decidedly against this law. All the leading denominations have their periodicals, and these affect in a very high degree the public mind. . . . .[131]

The editor quoted from *Zion's Herald* (Methodist) of Boston that we "ought to obey God rather than man." From *Zion's Advocate* (Baptist): "It is absurd to suppose that the freeman of the North will quietly submit." From the *Christian Watchman* of Boston: "Denounce the abomination. . . . ." By way of summary he said: "But the religious papers of all sects, are all on one side, and all speak one voice. We ought to quote from the *'Presbyterian'* and the *'Congregationalist,'* but we have not room. Suffice it to say, they all speak one voice."[132]

While the General Synod of the Lutheran Church was silent regarding the Compromise and the Fugitive Slave Law, the Franckean Synod of upper New York State, unaffiliated with the General Synod, adopted a resolution in convention at West Sand Lake, June 25, 1851, which was put very forcibly. "That the late Fugitive Slave Bill, passed in Congress is the ill-shapen and hydra-headed offspring of bold usurpation and unmitigated cruelty; that it has no safeguard in the natural and social rights of man, nor can it find any sanctions in the clear pealings of thunder of Sinai, its blazing fires, and the voice of God or in the teachings of Calvary."[133]

In 1843, the slavery issue divided the Society of Friends (Quakers) in Indiana into two groups, the seceding party formed the Anti-Slavery Friends Society and established rival friendly meeting houses known as Liberty Halls. But when the Fugitive Slave Act was passed in 1850, all the meeting houses of the Society of Friends of Indiana became Liberty Halls.[134]

[131]XXIII, No. 19, 74.

[132]*Ibid.*

[133]Heathcote, *op. cit.*, p. 16

[134]Jesse Macy, *The Anti-Slavery Crusade* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920), pp. 121-22.

Side by side the clerical radicals who yearned for immediate action, violence perhaps, were those moderates who cautiously advised peaceful means, endurance, and repeal.

The editor of the New School Presbyterian *Central Christian Herald* of Cincinnati, in November 1850, based his views upon the "higher law," but counseled legal and constitutional means to rid the nation of the Fugitive Slave Law. The Constitutional provisions protecting legalized oppression were inconsistent with the "higher law," and Congressional laws passed to carry out such provisions were morally wrong and should not bind men's consciences. The remedy should be a constitutional repeal, not violence.[135]

The avoidance of violence and haste was the advice given by the Rev. Mr. Dewey in an address before a union protest meeting held at Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in December 1850. He undoubtedly was voicing the sentiments of the large number of Northern clergy, who were anti-slavery moderates in feeling, not radical abolitionists. The address was reported in the *Christian Inquirer* (Unitarian) of New York City.

> We are all abolitionists at the North, if abolishing slavery can make us so. . . . . I feel for the poor fugitive, and I will do whatever I can to save him from his fate. . . . . His going back is a thing most painful to me. But it is a thing which may be rightly suffered to save this nation from dismemberment and destruction. . . . . No, there must be some other way than that of violence and haste for dissolving this terrible bond of slavery—for dissolved it must be.[136]

In commenting upon Dr. Dewey's address the editor of the *Christian Inquirer* anticipated the idea of the "irresistible conflict." He was convinced that there was a sectional Southern hostility and incompatibility which no law or Northern concession could dissolve. On the one hand, he saw fearfully no remedy, and on the other, imperative need of checking slavery through the moral sense of the North. This divisive feeling was deemed older than the abolition movement or the union of the states, having been born across the Atlantic.[137]

In 1850, 1851, and 1852, general conventions were held in the interests of anti-slavery. A four day assembly, attended by more than two thousand clerical and lay delegates, convened in

[135] II, No. 31, 122. [136] V, No. 15, 1-2.

[137] *Ibid.*, No. 17, 2. "Slavery must be checked, or we perish, morally, socially, and at last, politically, and whence, except from the moral sense of the North, shall that check come?

Cincinnati in 1850. The purpose of the meeting was to throw the influence of the Christian Churches against slavery.[138] In the summer of 1851 Chicago was the scene of another such convention, one hundred of the two hundred and sixty-five delegates, being ministers including college presidents, professors, besides judges and lawyers. All denominations were said to be represented in this objective to enlist Christianity against slavery.[139] In 1852 a religious state convention met in Augusta, Maine, to consider the duty of the Christian Churches toward the slavery act, the call being signed by one hundred and sixty ministers and over seven hundred church members of all religious groups. One of the resolutions adopted by the convention was that the Fugitive Slave Act was "a violation of the Constitution. . . . . an inhuman instrument of oppression, and ought to be execrated and disobeyed. . . . . that slaveholders should be deterred from Christian recognition as much as liquor dealers. . . . ."[140]

These general conventions inspired denominations to organize anti-slavery sentiment and action within their own communions. For example, Albany, New York, was the scene of a general Congregational anti-slavery convention to counteract pro-slavery sentiment, to exclude the same from the Congregational missionary societies, and to excommunicate slaveholders from that fellowship.[141]

Thus Clay, Douglas, and Webster had given the nation the conciliatory Compromise of 1850 with the Fugitive Slave Act. But instead of achieving for the United States an era of calm, relief, peace, and rest straightway many Clergymen of the North launched a vigorous and comprehensive attack from the pulpit, the religious journal, the Underground Railroad, the denominational assembly, the anti-slavery convention, and the protest meeting. Here were the men of the land who supremely and uniquely symbolized law, order, morality, religion, and character. These same men bitterly attacked a national law, some waiting for patient repeal, others for impatient and immediate nullification. Their hatred of slavery bred hatred of the South, a decade of sectional strife.

[138]Henry Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 713.
[139]Austin Willey, *op. cit.*, pp. 376-77.
[140]*Ibid.*, pp. 385-87.
[141]*Ibid.*, p. 407.

CHAPTER II

The Clergy and the Rising Tide of Social Action

The Ideology of Anti-Slavery Conviction

THE dissolution of the Federal Union appeared as a potentiality in 1850 and as an actuality in 1860. In the restless, radical, revolutionary fifties the slavery issue loomed upon the social scene as a Juggernaut, of beneficient or malignant growth, according to the point of view and attitude of the observer. The ideology of the Northern Clergy was a vital factor in the process of political change. If the speedy elimination of slavery is deemed a Christian ideal, and civil war an irresistible conflict, then the contribution of the Clergy is crowned with a halo of glory; but if social forces should have been permitted to take their course with reference to slavery, and sectional agitation and civil war are believed to have been unnecessary and nefarious, then the clerical example may be considered a factor in propaganda and a cause of strife and war. Our immediate concern is not to pass judgment upon the Clergy, but to afford them an opportunity to have them reveal their own attitude toward slavery, and the part they played in the rising tide of social agitation and action.

The dramatic episodes of the fifties that contributed to the intensification of anti-slavery conviction were the Fugitive Slave Act embodied in negro hunts, *Uncle Tom's Cabin,* and the creation of a lurid Southern panorama, the lashing of Senator Charles Sumner by Representative Preston S. Brooks, and the welding of sectional support for each, the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the method of Squatter Sovereignty, incarnated by Senator Stephen A. Douglas, alleged demoniacal opponent of the Northern Clergy, the Dred Scott Decision, and the nationalization of slavery, the direct action of John Brown, and the Ballot and Political Secession.

The social keynote of the fifties was sounded by the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati, who observed in June 1850: "Christians are becoming anti-slavery from principle—the politicians will soon follow from expediency. . . . ."[1]

We have noted the tremendous uproar that was caused by the Fugitive Slave Act of September 1850, not only in the ranks of laymen, but especially in the realm of the Northern Clergy. That furor in clerical consciences the next ten years was both continuous and continuing. While every few years in the fifties there were periodic outbursts against the South and slavery, in the so-called quiet intermittent years, steady progress was made in the expansion of anti-slavery conviction.

The ideology of the Northern Ministers in this era of the rising tide of social action may be briefly summarized:

1. The Supremacy of the Higher Law.
2. From radical emotion to cool conviction in anti-slavery opposition.
3. Slavery a moral wrong.
4. A house divided against itself.
5. The emergence of Northern sectional consciousness.
6. The duty of the Church to crucify slavery.
7. The Irresistible Conflict.

The tremendous impact of ten years of hammering and pounding upon one great social issue, that of slavery, inevitably led to sectional misunderstanding, misrepresentation, and misinterpretation. In essence many of the Northern Clergy deemed themselves God-commissioned knight-errants to crusade against the devil of slavery.

The imperative implications of the "higher law" were stressed in January 1851 in a sermon entitled *The Limits of Civil Obedience* by the Rev. Nathaniel Hall of First Church of Dorchester, Massachusetts. "The principle is that we are bound to obey the requisitions of human law, except where they conflict with the law of God, as made known in our souls and in His Word; that we are bound by an authority higher than its own, to do in all cases and always what is proclaimed to us as right. . . . ."[2]

[1]XVII, No. 25, 98.
[2](Boston: Wm. Crosby & H. P. Nichols, 1851), p. 17.

In 1852 Northern Christians who were in sympathy with the slavery system or who maintained a neutral or indifferent position on that issue were embarrassed when the Rev. J. G. Fee, who was elected president of the Anti-Slavery Convention at Cincinnati in that year, "advocated the withdrawal of Christians from Churches that did not denounce slavery," and declared that "we must break up caste, in order to break up slavery. . . . ."[3]

The anti-slavery turbulence led by the preachers in 1850 and 1851 increased in virulence through the fifties as some vitriolic incident exploded like a bomb-shell in the nation. Sidney Wilder observed the situation in 1853 in his article, "Thoughts on the Anti-Slavery Movements of the Age." He was certain that there never had been a time in the history of our country when the issue of slavery had been so boldly and ably discussed in the national councils as within the few years past, and never such deep feeling upon this subject as then.[4]

The anti-slavery tension was greatly magnified during the Kansas-Nebraska emergency in 1854, Douglas having reported the bill on January 4th, which was not passed until May 30th. The change in the nature of the opposition to slavery because of this legislation was noted by the *Central Christian Herald* (Presbyterian) of Cincinnati, as a transformation from rampant radicalism to sane determination, from noise and bitterness to calmness and deliberation.[5]

Northern clerical travelers in the Southland returned with a first-hand tale of their experience with the institution of slavery, which was communicated fervently to attentive congregations. In June 1854 the Rev. Ezra S. Gannett of the Federal Street Meeting House of Boston included in his sermon on the *Relation of the North to Slavery* his experiences of his Southern trip in 1853. He was convinced that he possessed an open mind, that he saw slavery under its most favorable aspects, and that he was firmly persuaded that slavery was a grievous wrong, utterly indefensible and unjustifiable.[6]

Other ministers had advanced from the position that slavery was a moral wrong to the practical method of dealing with the

[3] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XIX, No. 18, 70.
[4] *New York Baptist Register* (Utica), XXX, No. 36, 141.
[5] V, No. 45, 177.
[6] (Boston: Crosby, Nichols, 1854), pp. 11-12.

evil. In June 1854 the Rev. Eden B. Foster, Congregationalist, of Lowell, Massachusetts, suggested as a last resort the method of peaceful disunion, exhausting first, however, the possibilities of changing public opinion and the use of the ballot. He had in mind a peaceful secession of the North to check slavery aggressions and restore the loss of Nebraska. In the event that public opinion, the ballot, and peaceful disunion failed, Mr. Foster would exile his family and himself to a freer land, Great Britain.[7]

On July 11, 1854, four years before Lincoln's "House Divided" speech of July 17, 1858, the Rev. Theodore Parker discussed that theme in his sermon on, *The Dangers from Slavery.*

> There can be no national welfare without a national unity of action. That cannot take place unless there is a national Unity of Idea in fundamentals. Without this a nation is a 'house divided against itself,' of course, it cannot stand. . . . .[8]

Insidious religious sectional comparisons were brought into the strife. In August 1854 Southern Christianity became involved in this clerico-political question of slavery. In the comparison of Northern with Southern Methodism the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* of Cincinnati declared that the creed of the Southern Methodist Episcopal Church was based upon a brutal licentiousness lower than that of polygamous Mormonism.[9]

While this view was, in reality, but a phase of the sinfulness of slavery, in this instance, religion itself was tarred and feathered by such accusations.

In 1855 the central importance of the slavery controversy, its far-reaching effects, the resultant Christian duty, and the increasing religious discord in the nation was well reported by the editor of the *Christian Times* (Baptist) of Chicago. Slavery was deemed one of the great topics of the times, probably the most discussed, with vital religious, moral, and social implications, the duty of the Christian being to testify against it. The editor believed slavery to be wrong and evil, desired its abolition, had no sympathy for Fugitive Slave Laws, and thought that Northern Christians should regard slave-tolerant Southern Christians as being un-Christian in their conduct.[10]

[7] *Two Discourses* (Lowell: J. J. Judkins, 1854), pp. 71-72.
[8] "Old South Leaflets" (Boston: Old South Meeting House), Vol. IV.
[9] XXI, No. 35, 138.
[10] II, No. 24, 2.

In July of 1855 the editor of the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago hoped for the emergence of a Northern sectional consciousness as the inevitable result of the slavery conflict. The most important trend of the hour was the attitude of the "Know Nothing" Party toward the South. Writing under the sectionalizing title, "There is a North," the editor found hope in the attitude of the "Know Nothing" Convention in Philadelphia toward Southern claims, contempt for Southern bravado and threats. The editor said: "As Christian men, we rejoice that a political party will for once stand on the foundation of right and truth. . . . ."[11]

A month later the same religious newspaper carried a news story treating "The Higher Law," which concluded with the query, "What son of the Puritans—what believer in the Bible—nay, what consistent theist can question this?"[12] There was something fascinating and irresistible about the idea of "higher law." It seemingly involved eternal laws of God, not log-rolling legislation of sectional politicians, the sacred principles of the Christian Gospel, not temporal schemes of economic expediency, and the ideals of democracy and freedom, against the ideas of tyranny and slavery. And all this came as a part and parcel of the Christian Gospel Message from the sacred desk and religious press.

The national scene in battle-array and in pitched battle was the characterization of the slavery situation in 1856 according to the sermonic interpretation of the Rev. A. L. Brooks of the Third Presbyterian Church of Chicago.

> Our national territory is now the battle ground, where our national institutions, our civil liberty, our personal freedom, the freedom of the press and of the pulpit, our liberty of conscience and of settlement, our national honor and perpetuity, are pitted against slavery, white and black, against tyranny. . . . . The great question of this supremacy (Slavocracy) is now to be settled; the strife is now raging. . . . .[13]

The limits to which Northern opponents of slavery would go to undermine that economic system was revealed in a remarkable open letter addressed: "To Christian Men and Women Held

[11] III, No. 14, 2.
[12] *Ibid.*, No. 18, 1.
[13] *An Appeal for the Right* (Chicago: Daily Democrat Press, 1856), p. 8.

in Slavery in the Southern States," which appeared in the spring of 1856 in the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago. Such a communication was highly inflammable, being an inspiration to anti-slavery supporters, an incitement to liberate slaves, and an enragement to Southern whites, especially the planter-slave-owning group. The anonymous epistle addressed the slaves as "Dear Brethren and Sisters." It was veritably a brochure descriptive of the activities and advantages afforded by the Underground Railroad. Escape was advised if practicable, but not through insurrection and war. Escape was a duty if opportune.[14]

Here was a Northern denominational journal of the old Northwest carrying printed matter that was in direct defiance of the laws of the nation, a connecting link between religion and the clergy on the one hand, and the forces of anti-slavery and the Underground Railroad on the other. When the forces of religion cease to be the supporters of law and order, and rightly or wrongly urge illegal means to thwart constitutional law—then such applied activities of Christianity have a vital share in the oncoming events of strife and conflict. Such was the case in the fifties and the sixties.

Another survey of the slavery emergency was made in 1856 by the *Christian Times* of Chicago, a Baptist paper. Basic in the situation were the far reaching implications of the "higher law." Politics, slavery, morals, and religion were becoming inextricably enmeshed.

> It seems to be felt that the fate of great political parties quiver in the balance. . . . . We see underlying all purely political questions a moral one of paramount significance and moment. . . . . This greater issue is between the divine and the human law; between constitutions and statutes on the one side, and the essential, eternal *right* on the other—the right whether found in man's conscience, or in God's revealed Word. . . . . It may not always be right to resist the execution of oppressive and unjust laws; but it can *never* be right to obey man than God. . . . .[15]

The South also witnessed the fact that the North was in the midst of a religio-political upheaval and that the Northern Clergy were in the thick of the social strife in the autumn of

[14]IV, No. 6, 1. [15]III, No. 28, 2.

1856. The *Richmond (Va.) Christian Advocate* (Methodist) asserted that, "In the North ministers rival the most furious politicians in the agitation that shakes the country like the throes of an earthquake. . . . . Slavery, Kansas, Sumner. . . . . are the themes on which the pulpit has been sweltering for some time past. . . . ."[16]

A philanthropic incident with pervasive political, religious and "slavery" ganglia was related to the establishment of "A Pro-Slavery Methodist Church in Washington." The reason given for such a church was the "strong feeling of abolitionism pervading most of the Protestant churches." The story "made the news" from Richmond, Virginia, to Sandusky, Ohio, because among the contributors to the project was the "Hon. Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois, $100. . . . ." The explanatory statement was: "Mr. Douglas' friends claim that he was influenced in his subscription of one hundred dollars entirely by his zeal for religion." The gift by the Senator was both a liability as well as an asset to his local and national reputation.[17]

Christianity should crucify slavery. Christian Churches should not receive slave-holders into their fellowship. The wiping out of slavery should have the right of way among all the national problems. These in essence were the ideas embodied in the paper read by the Rev. Jacob Bailey of Beloit, Wisconsin, in 1857 before the Walworth Ministerial Conference.

> But that it (slavery) should have ever been . . . . tolerated by the Christian Church puts all shame to the blush. . . . . As well might heaven and hell be wedded in an eternal alliance, as American Slavery and Christianity be joined together. . . . . No, no, away with it, let it be crucified, let it be crucified. . . . . To treat the slave-holder, so far as Christian fellowship is concerned, in anywise different from a man-stealer or robber, is to connive at his guilt and become a partaker of his evil deeds. . . . . No true church of Christ can receive a slave-holder into her fellowship . . . . in his iniquity. . . . . It is the duty of the Church of Christ, in all her branches and departments, to be decided in relation to this gigantic evil. . . . . Lastly as a duty that should take precedence of all others. . . . .[18]

[16]Quoted by *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXIII, No. 44, 174.
[17]*Daily Commercial Register* (Sandusky, Ohio), VI, No. 276, 2.
[18]*The Christian Times* (Chicago), V, No. 1, 1.

In December 1857 a realistic editorial entitled "The Coming Conflict" was published in the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston. The Slavery-Freedom battle must be fought on its own merits.

> The conflict is already well advanced. . . . . A very little powder in the center of the rock does more to disintegrate it, than tons exploded outside of it. The cause of freedom must work chiefly like leaven inside the limits of slavery. . . . . Slavery is weak even in its own territory . . . . (and it) exists only by the ignorance and consequent sufferance of its white victims in the slave States themselves. . . . .[19]

The Churches and Clergy, North and South, at swords points through the fifties and increasingly so toward the latter years of the decade, caused a mutual sectional sore that became infectious, contagious, and thoroughly malignant. The sinfulness of slavery and the duty to refuse fellowship to slaveholders—standard opinions of many Northern Clergy—cut to the quick the South, especially the Southern clergy.

The Rev. Henry T. Cheever in his *Tract for the Times* published in 1859 asked the question: "Is it right to withhold fellowship from churches or from individuals that tolerate or practice slavery?" His inevitable answer was: "Let these signs of fellowship be generally withheld. . . . ."[20]

Judgment upon Southern Methodists was pronounced in vigorous fashion by the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York City in 1859.

> Such is the difference between Methodism North and South; and it is a difference as great as between light and darkness, right and wrong. . . . . Northern Methodism pronounces (slavery sinful), but Southern Methodism refuses to pronounce it—'a great evil.' . . . . Southern Methodism has . . . . leaped into the abyss of guilt and dishonor.[21]

The position of the above journal regarding slavery was: "We regard . . . . slavery as a great moral evil and slaveholding where it is practicable to liberate it as a sin against God and man. . . . ."[22]

[19]XXXVI, No. 51, 202.
[20](New York: John A. Gray, 1859), pp. 1-16.
[21]XXXIV, No. 11, 42.
[22]*Northwestern Christian Advocate* (Chicago), VII, No. 28, 110.

In the autumn of 1859 the editor of the *Friends' Review* (Quakers), while forbidding the use of force in the settlement of the slavery issue, suggested a boycott of slave-made goods, a proposal that would inflame the South as much as harsh "abolition words."[23]

As the fifties drew to a close the idea of "Irrepressible Conflict" loomed larger and larger upon the politico-religious horizon, verging upon the Southern plan of disunion, secession. In June 1860 the editorial upon the above theme by the clerical editor of the *Christian Watchman and Reflector* (Baptist) of Boston wrote: "We assert the fact of an irrepressible conflict between freedom and slavery, because where the latter exists, it will not and can not permit free discussion. . . . ."[24]

When secession did come—the constant ten-year flood of agitation, irritation, attack, counter-assault had so alienated the North and South that the climax of this decade of abuse might well have been a reply to George Beckwith of the American Peace Society, who had requested all ministers to preach a sermon on peace in the fall of 1860 to avert a civil war. On December 27, 1860, the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago declared:

> That this is no time to "cry peace, peace, for there is no peace," there can be no peace. It would be traitorous cowardice to God and to humanity, to our fathers and to our children, for us to cultivate the grace of submission to such demands. War with all its horrors, is a less evil than the subjugation of our whole country to the barbarism of slavery. No, let the pulpit ring out that maxim of our fathers: "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God." Let the clergy now, as in the days of the Revolution, educate the people in a knowledge of their rights and prepare them for stern work, apparently just before them, of defending those rights with sword and bayonet.[25]

The drive for peace on the part of the Northern Clergy is discussed later in the section treating Secession. We have sketched briefly the ideas of higher law, the change in the anti-slavery opposition, the moral wrong, a house divided, Northern sectionalism, the Church's task to wipe out slavery, and the

[23] XIII. No. 7. 107.
[24] XLI. No. 25. 2.
[25] VIII. No. 39. 2.

emerging irresistible conflict. The ideology of anti-slavery strife was ever increasingly surcharged with emotion, excitement, and moral conviction.

DRAMATIC FICTION AND HARRIET BEECHER STOWE

There is a power, an irresistible power in a book, especially when that book dramatized the seamy side of civilization, and portrayed that aspect as the complete picture and spirit of that way of life.

When the authoress of this powerful volume, Harriet Beecher Stowe, was introduced to President Lincoln, his remark is said to have been: "So you're the little woman who wrote the book that made this great war."

During 1851-1852 Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, daughter of Lyman Beecher, and sister of Henry Ward Beecher, contributed a serial slave tale, *Uncle Tom's Cabin,* to the *National Era Magazine.* It met with no phenomenal response, but was considered of sufficient worth to be re-published in book form, then to be accorded a most enthusiastic reception in the Northern States and in Europe. The volume aroused consternation and fury in the South. In this sectional literary melee the Northern Clergy contributed their share of moral criticism of this best seller.

The most highly favorable review of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* naturally came from the outstanding abolition center of northern Ohio, Oberlin. *The Oberlin Evangelist* commended the novel in May of 1852 in these words:

> The unrivaled tale . . . . (has) taken its place among the very first productions of genius and Christianity. . . . . It gives you the truth about slavery. It draws no caricatures, overstrains none of its pictures . . . . impressions of candor and fairness. . . . . It gives you not one side of the system only, but all sides—not one phase only, but all its phases. . . . . Mrs. Stowe has done a noble work towards hastening a consummation so glorious (the overthrow of slavery). . . . . Higher praise than this we cannot give, and need not.[26]

A more moderate evaluation of the book was presented by the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati in May 1853. While accepting the factual material,

[26]XIV, No. 10, 78.

the editor objected to the dramatic method of handling the story, which he felt would inevitably distort the facts. He further was of the opinion that the constructive work that the South was conducting among the negroes should be related as well as this darker picture.[27]

The advice of the editor was admirably carried out in an article treating the "Missions of the M.E. Church South" which appeared in his journal in June 1853, in which the favorable as well as the unfavorable aspects of slavery were unfolded.

> . . . . the Cabins, and other popular works of the times are occupied almost solely in pointing out the evils of slavery, and the bad deeds of the slaveholders. This is unfair, and morally wrong. We believe it (slavery) is a sin. . . . . We think the truth and the whole truth is the best. . . . . We maintain that the Southern Churches are doing one of the greatest missionary works in the world (among the slaves).[28]

A critique that fairly reeked with brimstone came from the pen of the editor of the *Calendar* (Protestant Episcopal) of Hartford, Connecticut, in January 1858. Embedded in an editorial entitled "Beecherism" were the acid remarks that "Mrs. Harriet Stowe's 'Uncle Tom' is a libel upon one half of the professing Christians of the country, and a canonization of the negro. . . . ."[29]

As late as 1859 the editor of the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston penned a very sympathetic interpretation of Mrs. Stowe's literary effort. "The sweet, religious spirit of this book, so practical, so humane and tender that it charms all sects and nations, makes its progress toward a universal diffusion over the globe a matter of Christian interest. . . . ."[30]

The foregoing opinions are representative of the wide variety of responses evoked by the "Cabin" in the religious world of

[27]XX, No. 19, 74. "It was, in all material parts, either founded on facts, or that such facts existed in abundance in the operations of the slave system, to give good foundations for Mrs. Stowe's descriptions. In this respect, the Cabin is true to life; and sober, impartial Southern men acknowledge this, and those who represent the Cabin as a bundle of lies, either do not know what they say or are not honest enough to tell the truth. . . . . Still, we always objected, and we now object, to Mrs. Stowe's mode of discussion—we mean the romance, or the story or tale. We believe this is unsafe in discussing morals, and in maintaining truth. The element of imagination in use will always throw doubt around facts. . . . . "

[28]*Ibid.*, No. 25, 97.

[29]XIV, No. 678, 12.

[30]XXXVII, No. 6, 21.

the Northern States. The entire range of plus to minus was recorded in the criticism of the novel.

THE LASH OF THE GUTTA PERCHA CANE

Senator Charles Sumner, the ardent anti-slavery leader from Massachusetts, delivered his famous or infamous speech on "The Crime against Kansas" in the United States Senate May 19-20, 1856. Two days later Congressman Preston S. Brooks from South Carolina publicly whipped Sumner in the Senate Chamber because he deemed certain remarks of Sumner a slander upon his State and a relative.

The Rev. Ralph Waldo Emerson on May 26th spoke in the Town Hall in Concord, New Hampshire, upon the pertinent and timely topic "The Assault upon Mr. Sumner." In the course of his address he declared:

> The outrage is the more shocking from the singularly pure character of its victim. . . . . Well, sir, this noble head, so comely and so wise, must be the target for a pair of bullies to beat with clubs. The murderer's brand shall stamp their foreheads wherever they may wander in the earth. . . . .[31]

"The Latest Atrocity" was the title of the pungent editorial in the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago the latter part of May. Reference was made to the "late ruffian attack on Mr. Sumner in the U. S. Senate."[32] Brooks was described as a symbol of Southern chivalry and aristocracy.

> Men born to rule, accustomed to the use of brute force, and the driver's whip, constitute a class of gentlemen, who cannot allow such liberties (public criticism). . . . . Slave Power cares neither for color nor position. Inherently insolent and barbarous, it lashes and murders, so far as practicable whatever opposes its will. . . . . At once, plantation discipline is administered, and a contemptible slave drive from the South, flogs him as he would a fractious slave at home.[33]

The writer then broadened the assault of Sumner as representative of the insecurity of the entire male population of the United States, and was apprehensive lest the North ignore it.

[31] *The Works of: Miscellanies* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1878), pp. 234-37.
[32] IV, No. 9, 2.
[33] *Ibid.*

> The North is expected to endure all this. We fear the North will endure it. . . . . It was a blow at the right and safety of every man in these United States; it was a blow aimed at every one who dares to think and act as a man. . . . . a blow at Massachusetts. . . . . For fifty years there has been a succession of atrocities, each one more insulting and gross than its predecessor—yet all of them with a few struggles submitted to.[34]

The preacher-statesman and colleague of Sumner, Senator Edward Everett expressed his horror at the Brooks-Sumner episode as follows: "Lawless violence of which I know no example, in the annals of constitutional government, has at length stained the floor of the Senate Chamber with the blood of a defenseless man, and he a Senator from Massachusetts. . . . ."[35]

"A Reign of Terror" was the subject of the sermonic defense of Senator Sumner, by the Rev. Joseph Henry Allen, June 1, 1856, at the Union Street Church of Bangor, Maine. Sumner's speech was depicted as "a noble and brave protest against a political crime on the floor of the Senate"[36] and Brook's attack as a "cowardly assault on a gentleman unarmed and pinioned to his desk, and blows barely short of death. . . . ."[37] Sumner was portrayed as

> a gentleman . . . . a man singularly courteous and refined—with that breeding, both as gentleman and scholar, which is so rare among the statesmen of this country. . . . . Of all those who are equally eminent in public life, none has won a more pure and unsullied fame. . . . . It is important to understand, that Mr. Sumner is the victim of a conspiracy to crush the freedom of congressional debate on that (slavery) topic. . . . .[38]

Brook's cane whipped not only a New England Senator, but also the North and many Northern Clergy into a counter-attack of dismay, disdain, and disapprobation. It was as dramatic an episode as Mrs. Stowe's novel. In the book, Uncle Tom was whipped; in the Senate, Charles Sumner was whipped; and the anti-slavery forces asserted the nation was also whipped.

[34] IV, No. 9, 2.

[35] P. R. Frothingham, *Edward Everett, Orator and Statesman* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1925), p. 405.

[36] (Bangor, Maine: Samuel S. Smith, 1857), pp. 4-5.

[37] *Ibid.*

[38] *Ibid.*

SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY AND STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

When the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, espoused by Senator Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois, became a law in 1854, it established the principle of popular or squatter sovereignty, that each territory was permitted to decide for itself whether or not slavery was to be allowed. Although the bill did not become a law until May 30, 1854, it aroused a furor of discussion from the moment of its inception to the passage of the same as a law, and among the debaters of this measure, the Northern Clergy were not reticent in registering their convictions.

The increasing intensity of emotional reaction was disclosed in a series of editorials in the *New York Baptist Register* (Utica) in January, March, June, and November, 1854.

> The South, we can hardly think will approve it. But should it be otherwise, there will be but one feeling in the Northern section in regard to it. There will be an end to the present conservatism, and one voice only will be heard, and that of the most unqualified condemnation of this flagitious enterprise.[39]

To this change from conservatism to condemnation, in the January editorial, the editor added a dire warning in March. The title of his editorial was "The Nebraska Outrage." "What madness in Douglas and his reckless associates to persist in their efforts . . . . to pluck down ruin on their own heads, and peril the integrity of the Union. . . . ."[40]

But a drastic change in Northern policy concerning the Southern threats of disunion was also significant.

> The haughty and contemptuous treatment of the South has been so long borne by the North that, where any resistance has been shown to their intolerable insolence, the threats of secession and dissolution have been expected to quiet all down to submission.—But this kind of manoeuvre has now had its day, the terror is over . . . . these threats will never again influence the North to yield a single hair to the exactions of slavery.[41]

Then in June about a week after the bill became a law, the editor discussed the theme: "Anti-Slavery Sentiment at the

[39] XXXI. No. 1, 2.
[40] *Ibid.*, No. 10, 38.
[41] *Ibid.*, No. 20, 78.

North." He disclosed that the measure, instead of being a victory for the South, deepened the wedge of sectional discord.

> But this outrage of human rights, has produced a change. Moderate men of a *moderate stamp* have been aroused. . . . . Men who have been as silent as death on the subject of Slavery, who have managed to satisfy themselves merely by saying, Slavery is a great evil, are now burning with a laudable zeal against it. There is now a deeper, and stronger anti-slavery feeling and sentiment throughout the Northern States than ever before. By this measure, so far as Slavery is concerned, the South has inflicted a dangerous wound upon herself.[42]

In agreement with his Baptist brother of the East, the editor of the *Christian Times* of Chicago in February 1854 described the Kansas-Nebraska Bill as "disgraceful."

Beginning in February of 1854 an equally vigorous succession of editorials appeared every few weeks in the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago, the keynote being a ringing challenge to slavery expansion. "Let the masses be convened then . . . . and declare as with voice of thunder, that the compact shall not be broken (Northwest Ordinance of 1787—provision prohibiting slavery) that no acre of free North-West shall be open to the incursion of Slavery."[43]

In the discussion of the "Nebraska Plot" in March the editor called upon the North to become sectionally self-conscious that the sentiment of liberty might thwart the schemes of pro-slavery politicians for all time.

> Let us, if possible, give to the sentiment of Liberty, such a potency, such a depth and height of importance throughout all the North, that it shall underlie and overtake all other public sentiment, and show the country henceforth and forever that there is a North. Let us awaken an all pervasive sentiment, before the righteous rebuke and heavenly strength of which all the effrontery of Slavery and all scheming machinations of selfish and profligate politicians shall be abashed now and finally. . . . .[44]

The rising sentiment against slavery-extension in 1854 was based upon and intensified by the seizures of fugitive slaves in the North. In the same month the *Congregational Herald*

[42] I, No. 25, 2. [43] I, No. 44, 2. [44] *Ibid.*, No. 48, 2.

attacked the proposed Kansas-Nebraska Bill in an article entitled "Slave Catching in Wisconsin." The reporter signed "M" told of the release from jail of a negro by the name of Glover who was a fugitive from the South. The mob after his forcible removal secreted him. Both the Fugitive Slave Law and the Nebraska Bill unitedly were solidifying public opinion against slavery and the South.

> All are unanimous in condemning the mode of Glover's arrest, and in executing the Fugitive Law, and the Nebraska iniquity. . . . . All confidence in the South is fading out of the hearts of even "Union Safety" men. . . . . The clergymen of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches have preached to their respective congregations upon the subject, and a remonstrance addressed to the House of Representatives . . . . is to be immediately circulated among the clergymen of this city (Racine, Wisconsin). . . . .[45]

From the religious journals, and the pulpits went the demands to the religious assemblies and associations to take strong action against this "slave extension" bill that had become a law in May. The General Association (Congregational) of Illinois went on record in June 1854, as "fully and deeply committed to the cause of anti-slavery,"[46] The Minnesota Congregational) Association in August 1854, Resolved:

> That the American Slavery is in our estimation a crime against God and man, and that it is the duty of the Church and of the whole nation to seek its extinction as speedily as possible. . . . . That we regard the Nebraska Bill as belonging to the same family with the Fugitive Slave Law— two of the darkest blots ever made upon the statute books of our nation. . . . .[47]

The New England Congregational viewpoint was summarized in July 1854 by a *Congregational Herald* editorial. "We rejoice at the strong and decided action taken in every important Congregational body that has met in or out of New England recently in reference to the Nebraska iniquity and the subject of slavery generally."[48]

In February 1854 the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)

[45] I, No. 44, 2., No. 52, 1.
[46] *Ibid.*, II, No. 9, 1.
[47] *Ibid.*, No. 22, 1-2.
[48] *Ibid.*, No. 15, 2.

in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware issued a Memorial of Remonstrance against the Kansas-Nebraska Bill.[49] A month earlier a similar memorial was approved by the New England Society of Friends at the yearly meeting held in Providence, Rhode Island.[50] An editorial in the *Friend* of Philadelphia admonished the constituency of that weekly to "bear in mind the great principle at stake."[51] Another memorial was drafted by the clergymen of the various denominations of New York City and vicinity, and signed by one hundred and fifty ministers.

The politicians who supported the Bill ignored the various memorials sent to Congress by ministers from the East, the Middle West, and Western States, until the huge protest signed by three thousand clergymen of the denominations of New England was presented to Congress in their behalf by Senator Edward Everett. This clerico-political petition thoroughly aroused the capitol politicians, and Stephen A. Douglas, the Little Napoleon of the Senate, led a ferocious iconoclastic verbal bombardment upon the clerical petitioners.

> It is presented by a denomination of men calling themselves preachers of the Gospel, who have come forward with an atrocious falsehood and an atrocious calumny against the Senate, desecrated the pulpit, and prostituted the sacred desk to the miserable and corrupting influence of party politics. I doubt whether there is a body of men in America who combine so much profound ignorance on the question upon which they attempt to enlighten the Senate as this same body of preachers.

The Congressional satellites of Mr. Douglas, re-inforced his blast against the clergy. "Of all others, they are the most encroaching, and, as a body, arrogant class of men," stated Mr. Mason. "When the clergy quit the province assigned them . . . . (and go about) as agitators . . . . they divest themselves of all the respect that I can give them," Mr. Butler is reported to have said. The attack of Mr. Adams was equally strong: "When they depart from their high vocation, and come down to mingle in the turbid pool of politics," he would treat them as other citizens. Mr. Pettit launched this vicious thrust at the clergy: "the waters of the pools of politics are infinitely more

[49] VII, No. 22, 345-46.
[50] *Ibid.*, No. 26, 408-409.
[51] *Ibid.*, No. 49, 391-92.

pellucid and pure and cheering and refreshing than the pool which surrounds their stagnant pools of theology." Mr. Badger grew eloquently literary when he compared the clergy to what Sir Walter Scott, in one of his novels, makes Cromwell say to the Rev. Mr. Oldenough: "Lack-a-day, lack-a-day. A learned man but intemperate overzeal hath eaten him up."[52]

The Rev. Mr. Beecher expressed the conviction that the petition evidenced an attempt to organize the nation's ministers into a sectional, political abolitionist party. He challenged the authority of religion to invade the sphere of government.

> It is our duty to expose the conduct of men, who under the cloak of religion, either from ignorance or willful misrepresentation, will avail themselves of their sacred calling to arraign the conduct of Senators here in the discharge of our duties . . . . I deny their authority, I deny that they have any such commission from the Almighty to decide this question. I deny that our Constitution confers any such right upon them. . . . .[53]

On the other hand, Senator Nathaniel P. Banks of Massachusetts, from whose state many of the petitioners were resident, defended his clerical constituents and those from the neighboring New England States declaring that

> they are not anarchists nor revolutionists. They are timid, conservative, inquiring, dependent men. They have no life-tenures, they accumulate no fortunes. They consolidate no powers. They organize no forces. Isolated and dependent, they have parted with no rights and have no selfish ends. The sincerity of their protestation is beyond question, as the earnestness of their appeal should be beyond censure.[54]

The opponents of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill led by Sumner and Chase had secured the denominational yearbooks of the names and addresses of the Northern clergy of the Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches, and sent to them an explanatory pamphlet appended by a Congressional form petition for their consideration and action. It was discovered later that Harriet Beecher Stowe at her suggestion financed the circulation of the petition which resulted in the monster protest from New England to Senator Everett.[55]

[52]Wilson, *op. cit.*, II, 393-94.
[53]G. F. Milton, *The Eve of Conflict* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1934), pp. 167-168.
[54]Wilson, *op. cit.*, II, p. 399.
[55]Milton, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

The Memorial of the New England Clergy which aroused the ire of politicians was in substance:

> The undersigned, clergymen, of different religious denominations in New England, hereby in the name of Almighty God, and in his presence, do solemnly protest against the passage of what is known as the Nebraska Bill. . . . . We protest against it as a great moral wrong, as a breach of faith eminently unjust to the moral principles of the community, and subversive of all confidence in national engagements; as a measure full of danger to the peace and even the existence of our beloved Union, and exposing us to the righteous judgment of the Almighty.[56]

It was dated March 1, 1854, and was followed shortly by another of like sentiments signed by five hundred ministers of various sects.

Among the signers were President Mark Hopkins of Williams College, President T. D. Woolsey of Yale, President Edward Hitchcock of Amherst, Rev. Lyman Beecher, Rev. Horace Bushnell, Rev. Theodore Parker, Rt. Rev. G. Burgess, Episcopal Bishop of Maine, and the Rev. Cyrus A. Bartol, three thousand and fifty clerical signers out of a total New England Protestant Clergy of approximately three thousand eight hundred.

Senator Edward Everett, who presented the monster petition to the Senate, represented the State of Massachusetts, and was an ex-governor of that state and a former clergyman. Opponents of the Kansas-Nebraska Act charged him with being lukewarm and half-hearted in his presentation of the protest. A letter to a friend revealed his true sentiments: "My position is extremely difficult here, as I am thrown, in spite of myself, into co-operation with men whose general course on this subject I greatly disapprove; while the ultraism of the South leaves no middle ground to stand upon."[57]

Mr. Everett's views upon negro slavery had been expressed in his Senate speech years before in support of the Compromise of 1850:

> I rise to speak for myself . . . . as a friend and supporter of the Compromise of 1850. . . . . I believe the Union of these States is the greatest possible blessing. . . . . But in relation to my fellow-citizens in the other parts of the country, I will treat their constitutional and

[56]Rhodes, "Chicago and the Old Northwest," *op. cit.*, I (1892), 478.
[57]Frothingham, *op. cit.*, pp. 357-58.

> their legal rights with respect, and their feelings with tenderness. . . . .[58]

A homiletic bombardment replied to Douglas and his cohorts, and he admitted that on one Sunday in New England from fifteen hundred to two thousand sermons were preached against the bill. The Rev. Dr. Horace Bushnell, the noted Congregational leader in Hartford, Connecticut, applied to Douglas the prophecy of the Hebrew prophet: "Tidings out of the East and out of the North shall trouble him; therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy and utterly to make away many, yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." Not only were sermons directed at Douglas and the Bill, but public forum meetings were held in churches, one of the largest crowds assembling in Broadway Tabernacle Congregational Church, New York City, the speakers of the evening being Henry Ward Beecher and John P. Hale. Two public meetings were held in Faneuil Hall, Boston with the Rev. Dr. Theodore Parker the orator of the gathering.[59]

"The Rights of the Pulpit" was the sermonic counter-barrage of the Rev. Eden B. Foster of Lowell, Mass., to Senator Stephen A. Douglas because of his attack upon the right of the clergy to protest against the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Speaking from the pulpit of the John Street Congregational Church, June 25, 1854, he declared that the "Nebraska Bill" violated "all divine laws, all republican principles, all national pledges, all human rights. . . . ." He then declared that ministers had a right to discuss slavery from the pulpit, because it was "in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel, and with the lofty purposes to which the pulpit is consecrated. . . . ." "Here, then," said he, "we stand upon the same platform with Mr. Douglas; and by our prerogatives as citizens of a free country, we have the same right to consider political questions as he has . . . . when three thousand and fifty (clergymen) from New England alone, with consentaneous voice a protest against a political measure, you may be sure the convictions of religious men, and the whole conscience of the country is profoundly moved. . . . ." Replying to the charge of Douglas that ministers were ignorant of political affairs, he said:

[58]Frothingham, *op. cit.*, pp. 348-49. [59]Rhodes, *op. cit.*, I, 496.

> I am acquainted with one minister, who has sought all the light which could be obtained from a careful perusal of Congressional discussions. . . . .He has derived some amount of instruction, even from the speeches of Mr. Douglas himself. Now, when men have taken so much pains to learn, it is somewhat unkind, as well as slightly uncivil, to tell them that they are totally ignorant, and it might be suggested, perhaps that if they are deplorably benighted, as to national affairs, their political teachers should bear part of the blame. . . . .

Mr. Foster then pointed out that "during this present Congress, three speeches, at least, have been made on this very Nebraska Bill by men who were ministers before they became politicians, and it will be admitted, I doubt not, by all that two of these speeches (those of Mr. Upham of Massachusetts, and Mr. Meacham of Vermont) occupy the very highest rank for extent of learning, vigor of thought, power of argument, and beauty of style, and that the third (that of Mr. Everett) might have been as able as any speech ever made in Congress, had he chosen to make it so. . . . ." Mr. Foster elaborated not only upon the right but the duty of a Christian minister to speak upon such a crisis:

> The supremacy of God's Word, and the rule of an enlightened conscience are the granitic foundations of all political grandeur; and it belongs to the minister to show this . . . . how could you forgive the minister, who is the watchman of the Lord, who is the expounder of the Bible . . . . who does not enforce these lessons . . . . who does not lift up the warning cry if he sees the laws of justice prostrated. . . . ? . . . . Such a measure is the Nebraska Law. . . . ."[60]

The editors of the religious periodicals defended the clerical petitioners and also condemned the Bill in the same articles. The Methodist editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* of Cincinnati, of November 1854, denied the charge of Douglas that the clergymen were a contemptible faction of ignorant dolts, and affirmed that they "stand at the head of the list of learned men for general intelligence, literature, and science."[61] The (N. S.) Presbyterian editor, also of Cincinnati, stated in the *Central Christian Herald* of May 1854: "They have passed a bill

[60]Eden B. Foster, *Two Discourses* (Lowell: J. J. Judkins, 1854), pp. 9-34.

[61]*Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXI, No. 48, 190.

that will do more to hasten the overthrow of the dark system than all that Northern abolitionists have done for the last ten years."[62] The Unitarian editor of the *Christian Register* of Boston was concerned because of the "peril that the people of the Free States may get accustomed to violations of the principles of liberty, of the doctrines of justice, of the righteous characteristics of laws, of the sacred sentiments of humanity."[63] The Unitarian editor of the *Christian Inquirer* of New York City declared his convictions in prophetic form:

> . . . . A struggle is impending between the principle of Liberty and that of Slavery; an awful struggle . . . . are now ready for their final battle . . . . either submission on the part of the slave power or Dissolution of the Union.[64]

The New England petition inspired a similar one from twenty-five Chicago divines, expressed in identical terms save that the claim to Divine plenary inspiration was reinforced. Mr. Douglas presented this petition from his constituents but wrote them a public letter requesting that they cease to interfere in the affairs of governmental business. Douglas' attacks occasioned a second petition from the Northwest of five hundred and four signers with an added resolution denouncing him for "his want of courtesy and reverence toward man and God."[65] Judas became the byword for Douglas and from the pulpits came the accent on Arnold in Stephen Arnold Douglas, suggestive of Benedict Arnold.[66]

The *Western Christian Advocate* editorially stated its position on "The Present Crisis."

> It is a purely pro-slavery measure, and, therefore, possesses all the moral evils inherent in the system of slavery. . . . . The bill is at variance with the great moral, Bible truth at the foundation of our political system. . . . . The passage of this bill . . . . would effectually set the north against the south, and the south against the north to an extent never before witnessed. . . . .[67]

The same journal declared later:

> The pointed petitions and remonstrances of the Protestant clergy of the North against the Nebraska Bill . . . .

[62] *Central Christian Herald* (Cincinnati), VI No. 8, 30.
[63] (Boston), XXXIII, No. 25, 98.
[64] *Christian Inquirer* (New York), VIII No. 23, 2.
[65] Milton, *op. cit.*, p. 168.
[66] Rhodes, *op. cit.*, I, 496. (Quoted by Milton, p. 168).
[67] (Cincinnati), XXI, No. 13, 50.

> inherent moral wrong . . . . really have stirred up a hornets' nest in some quarters . . . . this invasion of the pulpit is unjust. . . . . When politicians wage war with morality and religion, it is no longer a matter of right, but of duty, to maintain good morals and religion.[68]

The hornets' nest that the politicians stirred up apparently stung to the quick the religious sentiment of many Northern Church groups, and in turn thus inflamed the feelings of the South. The Northern Clergy in 1854 emerge as strong civic blocs in the East and West, seeking to influence Congressional action by public memorials of remonstrance and protest.

SLAVERY NATIONALIZATION AND DRED SCOTT

The Northern Clergy had met courageously on the field of forensic battle, sacred and secular, the leaders of Congress. Now they were face to face with the revered and august justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is ever a momentous occasion in any nation when the two supposedly most conservative forces in the State lock horns. The issue presented itself in a relatively unimportant case in 1857. Shall a negro valet be freed because he accompanies his master to a free state, and a free territory, and then returns to a slave state? The Supreme Court decided in the negative, and the Northern Clergy reviewed the judicial decision and the intrusive obiter dictum in far more virulent terms than "horse and buggy" analogies.

That a Divine Spiritual Supreme Court had the authority to recall the judicial decisions of the United States Supreme Court —as well as acts of Congress—was the opinion of the *Christian Times* (Baptist) of Chicago.

> There are some things that are far mightier than human legislatures or tribunals, and laws that are stronger than all human statutes or decisions. Slavery, even with the Federal Administration and the Supreme Court of Judicature on its side, must face the inevitable operations of those laws. . . . . As to the merits of this decision, we those laws. . . . . As to the merits of this decision, we think its unsoundness, in every sense, is manifest. . . . . Meanwhile, a 'higher law' is already at work.[69]

This decision was the "Triumph of Slavery" in that it nationalized slavery and destroyed liberty, according to the *Congre-*

[68] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXI, No. 15, 58.
[69] IV, No. 30, 2.

gational Herald of Chicago. "In the person of Dred Scott, Liberty is trodden to the Earth, and if this decision be valid, Slavery has henceforth every inch of American soil for its own. . . . . We have none but Slave States now."[70]

The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Chicago published the following attack on the Dred Scott Decision.

Upon this official crime the clergy should invoke the curses of the deity. This was the gist of an address by Dr. Demster at a mass meeting in Evanston, Illinois, on the theme: "The Dred Scott Decision."

> The act of the court is the tongue of a trumpet. It will cry to Heaven if we cry not against it. . . . . What then is the duty of the pulpit at such a crisis? . . . . Let the temples of religion ring with the maledictions of God. . . . . It is time that this profession—the ministers of truth, the guardians of religion and morals—should treat with ineffable scorn that whining hypocrisy which mourns the desecration of the pulpit, whenever it dares to arraign official crime.[71]

Possibly the most scalding, seething, and scathing attack on the decision was made by the editor of the *Oberlin (Ohio) Evangelist.* If words could blast, the reputation and dignity of the Supreme Court went with this wind.

> This is one of those monstrous iniquities whose depths no ordinary line can fathom. When you think you have reached the bottom, lo, there are still other depths below, yet unexplored. It is a multiform iniquity. Turn up whatever aspect of it you will, all is black and every new view of it seems yet a shade darker. . . . . It is too monstrous to be borne. . . . . As a ten-fold does of arsenic or strychnine rallies energy to the stomach to instant resistance . . . . so, here the main chance of life is in a healthful and most vigorous re-action. . . . . Better that the Government itself should crumble to atoms than that it should live by its iniquities, with monstrous wrong for its chief corner-stone.[72]

The East as well as the Northwest of Illinois and Ohio paid its respects to this Supreme Court ruling. In spite of strong opposition to anti-slavery and the recently announced Dred

[70]V, No. 29, 113.

[71]IV, No. 52, 2.

[72]XIX, No. 478, 76-77.

Scott Decision, Dr. Leonard Bacon (Congregational) threw down the gauntlet to slavery in the influential First Church of Christ in New Haven, Connecticut. Preaching on the topic: "Let the Oppressed Go Free" Dr. Bacon demanded:

> Slavery ought to be abolished and forbidden by the sovereignty of the people wherever that power extends. . . . . Why dare I say this . . . . when from the supreme tribunal of our laws, it has been announced that slavery is a national institution. . . . . God says it. . . . . Slavery is wrong . . . . and no statute, no custom, or tradition, no decree, no compromise, no constitution can make it otherwise than wrong. . . . .[73]

These sentiments comprise Dr. Bacon's concept of the "higher law."

The attitude of sorrowful obedience seemed to be the view of the Dred Scott decision held by the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York City. His respect for law and order as supremely symbolized by the highest court, of the nation, forbade his denunciation of that authority, and he based his hope of amelioration upon the use of legal and constitutional means.[74]

The editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati, delved into British history to reinforce his disapprobation of the decision. He considered its dire effect not only upon the liberty of the United States, but also the freedom of the world. Two outstanding verdicts affecting the liberties of mankind were: the decision in the trial of the seven bishops in the British Court of the King's Bench in 1688, and the recent Dred Scott decision of the United States Supreme Court, the former favorable to freedom, and the latter unfavorable.[75] The editor felt that the decision was "better befitting the dark ages than the middle of the nineteenth century."[76]

A cautionary exposition of applied Christian ethics was the method of approach regarding this decision by the *Friend's Review* (Quaker) of Philadelphia. Religious testimony against

[73] *Two Sermons* (New Haven: Thomas H. Pease, 1857), 22-23.

[74] XXXII, No. 14, 54. "While, therefore, we lament inexpressibly this decision; lament it as the saddest thing in our national life, the saddest not for us alone, but for the common cause of humanity, we would not forget our Christian duty to inculcate reverence for authority. We are a lost people when the supreme tribunal of the law has lost our respect. . . . . If we have bad laws, we should seek to correct them lawfully; if the constitution is wrong, we should seek to amend it constitutionally."

[75] XXIV, No. 12, 46.

[76] *Ibid.*, No. 13, 50.

slavery, not direct condemnation of the agencies of government, was the suggested normal Quaker social action.

> It is not for us to point out the duties which the existence of slavery . . . . and the constant efforts of the several branches of the Federal Government to extend, and cherish the system, impose upon every citizen who truly loves his country . . . . who believes that God 'hath made of one blood of the nations of men.'[77] . . . . The necessity for the maintenance of a faithful, practical testimony against the whole iniquitous system, was, therefore, never more imperative upon the Society of Friends and upon its members individually.[78]

During this appraisal of the Supreme Court of the United States by the Clergy of the North, the conservative weekly, the *American Presbyterian,* presented an adroit view of the avoidance of taking sides in the controversy, neither supporting nor condemning slavery or anti-slavery forces, but rather applying the Gospel to solve the needs of the emergency. By some it would be deemed the method of spiritual evolution and by others, an ostrich-like side-stepping the question.

> We will not endorse slavery; we will not annul the earnest protest of our fathers against its evil. . . . . Repudiating alike the false extremes that would exalt slaveholding as a blessing, or denounce it as involving essential sin, we will seek to bring the light of the Gospel to bear upon the difficulties with which it is encompassed. . . . .[79]

The effects of the Compromise of 1850 and the Fugitive Slave Law, of the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, and the Dred Scott Decision of 1857, were transforming the Northern movement for the overthrow of slavery, from the secular, almost infidelic, radical idea of abolition, into a civic and sacred ideal, supported by an increasing number of leading clergymen and government officials. Many of the Clergy were losing their respect for "supreme law."

DIRECT ACTION AND JOHN BROWN

The Northern Clergy through pulpit and press were stirred to effective utterance and waves of intense conflicting emotions surged through the nation when the radical Puritan abolitionist, John Brown, seized the Federal Arsenal at Harper's Ferry,

[77] X, No. 28, 440-41.
[78] *Ibid.*, No. 36, 568.
[79] Quoted by *Central Christian Herald* (Cincinnati), VIII, No. 48, 2.

Virginia, as a signal for a general slave uprising, October 16, 1859, resulting in the capture of Brown and his comrades, and his execution as a traitor December 2, 1859.

The Rev. Theodore Parker, one of the secret six supporting the crusades of John Brown, early in 1857, wrote to Judge Russell, who at that time had provided a Bostonian hideout for Brown, that the law might not reach him.

> If I were in his position I should shoot dead anyone who attempted to arrest me for those alleged crimes; then I should be tried by a Massachusetts jury and be acquitted. P. S. I don't advise J. B. to do this, but it is what I should do.[80]

This was quite a different Parker who had said in 1850 he would help fugitive slaves escape the law by any means save a weapon. Seven years of slavery agitation had placed a revolver in the hand of the Rev. Theodore Parker of Boston.

While touring Europe, Parker received word of Brown's escapade at Harper's Ferry, and wrote home:

> Brown will die like a martyr, I think, and also like a saint. His noble demeanor, his unflinching bravery, his gentleness, his calm religious trust in God, and his words of worth and soberness will make a profound impression on the hearts of Northern men; yes, and on Southern people. . . . . Let the American State hang his body, and the American Church damn his soul. . . . . The road to heaven is as short from the gallows as from the throne.[81]

William Lloyd Garrison, abolitionist layman and moral mentor of radical preachers, believed that "The Tragedy at Harper's Ferry" was "well intended, but sadly misguided" and that it would be "a terribly losing day for all Slavedom when John Brown and his associates are brought to the gallows. . . . ."[82]

Insanity was the explanation of John Brown and his deed, thought the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati. He declared that Brown "had acted the fool's part to admiration,"[83] and that "the whole movement on the part of Brown and his fellow-conspirators, was one of the most insane and foolhardy things we have ever read of."[84]

[80] J. W. Chadwick, *Theodore Parker* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1900), p. 335.
[81] *Ibid.*, p. 336.
[82] *The Liberator* (Boston), XXIX, No. 43, 170.
[83] XXVI, No. 43, 170.
[84] *Ibid.*, No. 44, 174.

Fanaticism or insanity was the reason given by the *Friend's Review* (Quaker) of Philadelphia. Since that religious body abhorred equally both force and slavery, Brown's crusade was disapproved. ". . . . the principal actors must have been laboring under a species of insanity, or the blindest fanaticism . . . . the means adopted as a remedy for the great evil of Slavery were equally inconsistent with Christianity, and totally indefensible on religious principles, we must deplore the occurrence. . . . ."[85]

Magnificent obsession would probably have been the modern characterization of the crusade of John Brown in the mind of Dr. Henry Ward Beecher of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. While Brown was awaiting trial Beecher declared from his pulpit:

> No one can fail to see that this poor, child-bereft old man is the manliest of them all . . . . that wounded old father is the most remarkable figure in this whole drama. The Governor, the officers of the State, and all the attorneys are pygmies compared with him. . . . . If they kill the man, it would not be so much for treason as for the disclosure of their cowardice. . . . .[86]
>
> I deplore his misfortunes. I sympathize with his sorrows. I mourn the hiding or obscuration of his reason. . . . . I shrink from the folly of the bloody fray. . . . . By-and-by, when men look back and see without prejudice the whole scene, they will not be able to avoid saying: 'What must be the measure of manhood in a scene where a crazed old man stood head and shoulders above those who had their whole reason? What is the average citizen when a lunatic is a hero?'[87]

A species of monomaniac with honest convictions who was brave and humane—was the curious description of Brown given by the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago.[88]

Amid all the furor between the capture and execution of Brown, the editor of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Chicago asked a most pertinent question: "Brown has scarcely had justice done him? . . . . Must that gray head be hurried madly to execution without the opportunity to ascertain by fair trial whether he was a sane man?"[89]

[85]XIII, No. 8, 120.
[86]*Freedom and War* (Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1863), pp. 1-21.
[87]*Christian Register* (Boston), XXXVIII, No. 46, 1.
[88]VII, No. 11, 2.
[89]VII, No. 45, 178.

Two significant editorials appeared in the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago, the one before and the second after the execution. The editor realized the tremendous impetus the hanging would be for the anti-slavery movement and how the deluded traitor would be soon transformed into the glorified martyr. In speaking of Brown and his associates the editor said:

> . . . . they have given an exhibition of unselfish love . . . . and moral daring. . . . . Brown and his comrades may be hung and that, too, more publicly than usual, as an example, but it will not put down anti-slavery agitation, it will not stop the running off of slaves, it will not smother the fear of insurrections, it will not insure a stop to the repetition of the recent emeute. . . . . The hanging of these men will be the sowing of the dragon's teeth. It will only heat up the fires of slavery. . . . .[90]

After the hanging the editor became prophetic:

> He has joined the noble army of martyrs to principle, and like the righteous Abel, "being dead, yet he speaketh." . . . . Virginia has sacrificed to the cowardice of conscious guilt the bravest man who has trod her soil for half a century; but the sentiment for which he bled survives its victim, and is stronger for his death. . . . . (Brown was) hung up as a spectacle to the "chivalry" of Virginia . . . . (he) has been the honored instrument of a Higher Power. . . . . The moral forces which are moving against it (slavery) will be quickened in their march, and in the death warrant of Freedom's Martyr, Slavery can read, as in letters of fire, its own approaching doom.[91]

A sermon on "The Execution of John Brown" filled nearly eight columns in the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago in December of 1859. On Sunday December 4th, Dr. W. W. Patton, Pastor of the First Congregational Church of Chicago, the outstanding pulpit of that denomination in the old North-West, preached a most timely sermon. The halo of John Brown was in the making, if not already created.

> And what will be the eventual result of his deeds and death? If partly evil, by man's imperfection, yet largely good by God's overruling. The error of his judgment will be eclipsed by the glory of his principles; and we shall forget his mistaken appeal to arms, and think only of his character, his motives, his sacrifices, and his death. It is not in vain that John Brown has died, in form as a traitor,

[90] VII, No. 34, 2. [91] *Ibid.*, No. 37, p. 2.

> in spirit as a martyr. Though his deeds came, seemingly to nought, his heroic daring, and his sublime contempt of death, even by the hand of the executioner, render him immortal. They have killed him, but they have given life to his principles.[92]

If the first step in the making of a martyr is to die for one's principles, the second is to embody those principles in a stirring movement, which was exemplified by the Rev. J. B. Bittinger in an article on "John Brown" in the *Central Christian Herald* (Presbyterian) of Cincinnati in December 1859.

> No man had ever been able to challenge so much sympathy, or admiration, as John Brown. . . . . The abolitionism of the North is changing to a moral sentiment, and herein lies its invincible power. . . . . It is because the Spirit of God is abroad in men's hearts that the career of Brown is drawn to it, and magnetized the feelings of the whole country.[93]

The third step is radiation of a spirit that is immortal. Therefore we see martyrdom complete in the pulpit declaration of the Rev. Frederick Frothingham of the Park Street Church of Portland, Maine, at the close of 1859: ". . . . a life has been manifested which cannot die. A Grave has been dug in which sleeps . . . . a hero, saint, martyr—A Power has gone forth stronger than Death. . . . ."[94]

And one day Northern troops would march Southward to the refrain:

> John Brown's body lies a-moldering in the grave,
> But his soul goes marching on.

There were others who dubbed Brown a devil not a saint.

At the same time Dr. Patton of Chicago was honoring John Brown, the editor of the border state journal, the *Presbyterian Herald* of Louisville bluntly declared that "John Brown deserved to die," that he "shed blood coolly and deliberately" and "he, therefore, was . . . . a murderer and a traitor. . . . ."[95]

One is surprised to find the division of opinion concerning the person and work of Brown, at that arch anti-slavery underground railroad station of Oberlin, Ohio. Three of the editors

[92] *Ibid.*, No. 39, 1.
[93] XI, No. 37, 137.
[94] *The Liberator* (Boston), XXIX, No. 52, 208.
[95] XXIX, No. 23, 2.

of the *Oberlin (Ohio) Evangelist,* outstanding representatives of the mind of that community, contributed signed articles in November and December, treating the John Brown Raid.

The Rev. Henry Cowles condemned the violence of the deed:

> We think he egregiously misjudged in regard to the means he used. . . . . It is not our purpose at all to vindicate Brown; we think him misguided and we unqualifiedly condemn such a resort to violence; but it is certainly due to him that his deeds should be judged fairly, and in the light of their manifest motives. . . . .[96]

The Rev. James A. Thome cautiously withheld judgment: "We are not prepared as yet to vindicate the virtue or the wisdom of his late operations, we are immeasurably far from joining with those who cast stones at this man."[97]

The Rev. James G. Fairchild staunchly supported Brown: "John Brown's wisdom was in his faith and his self-denying devotion to truth. This is what makes his name to-day a power in the land, and for this it shall stand a rich heritage to the good in all the coming ages."[98]

One of the most sympathetic interpretations of the cause and cure of John Brown was made by the *Friend,* a Quaker journal of Philadelphia in December. Taking the position that Brown was mentally ill and not a criminal, the editor said: "We think there can hardly be a reasonable doubt that, upon the subject of slavery, his mind dwelt with a morbid sensitiveness and constancy, converting his perceptions and conceptions into a hallucination, and deranging more or less, his reasoning upon it; for which it would have been far more rational, as well as Christian, to have placed him under curative treatment in a hospital, than to subject him to the dread penalty for treason and murder. . . . ."[99]

Although judging that Brown's enterprise was short-sighted and fanatic, the editor of the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston declared in December that the execution was "not the last of him in history; certainly not the last of him in his influence upon the destinies of our country."[100]

On the other hand the Presbyterian editor of the *New York Observer* intimated in January 1860 that Brown would go down

[96] XXI, No. 543, 178-79.
[97] *Ibid.*, pp. 182-83.
[98] *Ibid.*, No. 546, 203.
[99] XXIII, No. 14, 110-11.
[100] XXXVIII, No. 50, 198.

in history as a criminal. He was assured that the "good sense of an enlightened people will not suffer them to honor as a martyr a man who suffers the just penalty of the law for committing the highest crimes known to the laws of God and man."[101]

"John Brown and the Irrepressible Conflict" was the subject of an important article which appeared in the *Congregationalist* of Boston in January 1860. The writer asserted that a general almost a universal sympathy for Brown was manifest throughout the North and Northwest. He also felt a strong sympathy and high admiration for the Captain, and did not "think he was guilty of any crime, which ought to have cost him his life. . . . ."[102]

Then along came America's great thinker and philosopher, the Rev. Ralph Waldo Emerson, who from November to January added his public testimony to the person and work of John Brown.

Prolonged applause of an immense Boston audience greeted Mr. Emerson when he eulogized Brown in his lecture on "Courage" at Tremont Temple. " I wish we might have health enough to know virtue when we see it," he exclaimed, "and not cry with the fools 'madman' when a hero passes." He then suggested beatification, and canonization, verging dangerously near messiahship. He spoke of "that new saint, than whom none purer or more brave was ever led by love of men into conflict and death—the new saint awaiting martyrdom, and who, if he shall suffer, will make the gallows so glorious like the Cross."[103]

On November 18, 1859 a meeting was held in Tremont Temple, Boston, to raise funds for the relief of the Brown family. In his address on this occasion Emerson said glowingly: "Nothing can resist the sympathy which all elevated minds must feel with Brown, and through them the whole civilized world. . . . . Brown was an idealist. . . . ."[104] In January 1860 Emerson lectured on "John Brown" at Salem. He glorified Brown's "singleness of purpose" and felt that "all people, in proportion to their sensibility and self-respect, sympathize with him. . . . . All women are drawn to him by their predominance

[101]XXXVIII, No. 4, 30.
[102]XII, No. 3, 9.
[103]Rhodes, *op. cit.*, II, 413.
[104]*The Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson: Miscellanies*, pp. 253-54.

of sentiment. All gentlemen, of course, are on his side. . . . ."[105]

In February 1860 the Rev. George P. Prudden of Waterbury, Connecticut, delivered a lecture on the theme: "John Brown of Harper's Ferry" before the Young Men's Association in the First Congregational Church of Middlebury, of that state. The substance of his address was that the treason of Brown "was only against slavery, not against the Federal Union, not even against Virginia. . . . ."[106]

An aftermath of the John Brown Raid was summarized by the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati. It was

> . . . . the occasion of a bitterness of feeling which has never existed perhaps to the same extent before in this country. . . . . Under the false statement circulated by demagogues, that the northern pulpit deals in little else than political harangues, and glorifications of John Brown, a widespread hatred has been engendered against the northern clergy; and under its influence ministers belonging to at least four denominations—have been obliged to suffer, when no crime whatever has been proved against them. . . . .[107]

The person and work of John Brown had infused the Northern clerical leaders of social agitation with bold courage and resentment toward the South, and the South in turn had been seized by sectional fear and animosity toward the North. John Brown was the connecting link between rising tide of sectionalism on the one hand, and secession on the other. He was a climactic martyr in a long line of martyrs: the fugitive slaves, Uncle Tom, Charles Sumner, Kansan liberty-lovers, and Dred Scott.

The Northern Clergy had a direct share in supporting the adventures of John Brown. The Rev. Theodore Parker was one of his sponsors. The Rev. Ralph Waldo Emerson promoted the cause of relief for the family of Brown while he was imprisoned. Many of the Northern Clergy, while not approving the methods and deeds of Brown, were in hearty accord with his motives and ideals. Some ministers condemned him as a traitor and murderer, others deemed him a maniac and mentally sick, while

[105] *The Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson: Miscellanies.*, p. 262.
[106] *The Oberlin (Ohio) Evangelist*, XXII, No. 549, 21.
[107] XXVII, No. 6, 22.

still others crowned him as a symbol of a glorious ideal, or as a hero and martyr, even a saint. The Northern Christian ministers had their share, perhaps a predominant share, in the creation of the martyr-ideal, which was so triumphantly and harmoniously realized in the Civil War song, "John Brown's Body." John Brown was stimulated to social action by the Northern Clergy, and they in turn were impelled to carry on in spirit and in truth the incompleted task of their puritanical crusader. Neutral and conservative leaders, however, dissented.

THE BALLOT AND POLITICAL SECESSION

The dissolution of the Federal Union became imminent when the "Slave Power" lost control of the Presidency, notwithstanding the fact that the South still dominated the other departments of administration, and that the success of the Republican party in the election of 1860 was but a minority victory of a sectional party. Then the events of dissolution followed in swift succession: the secession of South Carolina on December 20th; Lincoln's message denying the constitutional right of secession on December 31st; the secession of Mississippi, January 9, 1861; Florida, January 10th; Alabama, January 11th; Georgia, January 19th; Louisiana, January 26th; the organization of the Southern Confederacy by seven Southern States, February 4th; the Washington Peace Conference, February 4th to the 27th; the siege and surrender of Fort Sumter, April 11th-13th; Lincoln's call for troops, April 15th; and finally the secession of Virginia, April 17th; Arkansas, May 6th; North Carolina, May 20th; and Tennessee, June 8th. The views of the Northern Clergy concerning political secession were inclusive of their attitudes toward slavery, the seceded Southern States, and the Federal Government.

The pre-Presidential election situation was well stated by the editor of the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago in June 1860. The title of the editorial, "Freedom's Battle," was a summary expression of the climax of a decade of sectional strife.

> A great warfare of principle is now going on in this country. The slave power from having heretofore had everything its own way without molestation, is now confronted with a mighty antagonist. The moral reformers have prepared the public mind, the political reformers

> are now taking up the moral sentiment manufactured to their hand, in order to organize it in opposition to the despotic power which has so long swayed our government.[108]

The influence and factor of religion in such a crisis was further elaborated by the editor.

> To have made the anti-slavery question so soon the issue in our political affairs, is a great accomplishment. . . . . In this conflict of principle the fighting is not limited to the leaders, or even the rank and file of political organizations. . . . . Every prayer, every appeal to conscience, every sermon, uttered in this behalf, will tell upon the great question.[109]

The chief issue of the coming national election was the subject of an editorial in the *Independent* of New York in July 1860. The editor wrote:

> The problem to be solved in this Presidential canvass, is not so much the future status of parties as the relative weight of the North and the South in the Federal Government. This question must ultimately determine the policy of the nation, as it certainly does the prospects of slavery as a domestic institution of the South. . . . .[110]

That the Clergy would unite in the presidential election against slavery, sin, and Stephen Douglas was implied in a *Congregational Herald* editorial a few weeks before the balloting.

> We were more than ever convinced after listening to this speech, that Mr. Douglas is an example of the infatuation and blindness of sin. In 1854 he made himself the assailant and defamer of three thousand New England clergymen of all denominations who remonstrated in a petition against this measure for opening Kansas and Nebraska to slavery. . . . . The time is but a few weeks distant when he will learn that it is not safe to despise the opposing influence and prayer of so many faithful ministers of Christ and their brethren in other portions of the land. . . . .[111]

The Northern Clergy would, therefore, form an unconscious political bloc or possible balance of power in the realm of national suffrage.

"The Consequences of the Election" was discussed by the editor of the *New York Observer* (Presbyterian). He felt that

[108] VIII, No. 10, 2.
[109] *Ibid.*
[110] XII, No. 607, 4.
[111] VIII, No. 28, 2.

the election was no occasion for disunion, that there was no danger unless the Federal Government committed an unconstitutional act, but that Southern hotheads might lead their followers to situations from which there could be no retreat.[113]

The *Presbyter* (Cincinnati) agreed with its New York contemporary that "there is no fear for the safety of the Union. Nine-tenths of the people in the free States, and a majority in the South will sustain the administration of Abraham Lincoln. . . . . The preservation of our Union depends largely upon Southern Christians. . . . ."[114]

"The Triumph" was the title of a post-election editorial in the *Congregational Herald*, which assured Union security.

> We congratulate our readers on the triumph of freedom in the presidential election . . . . we are far from regarding the war ended. . . . . The revolution has commenced and no mortal power can make it pause. . . . . We do not apprehend the dissolution of the Union as a result. There may be a few mad spirits who, from anger, will counsel it; but they will be held in check by the sober sense of their fellow citizens. The South can not afford to secede, and most certainly not in fractions. It must go as a whole, or not at all.[114]

That side by side the Southern loyalty for the Union was a maturing scheme in the South for Union dissolution was the belief of the editor of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Chicago. On November 21st he said: "the heart of the people of the South (revealed) . . . . a warm love for the Union,"[115] but he added a week later:

> We believe that secession and the organization of a Great Gulf Confederacy (or monarchy) is designed, and that the scheme has been maturing for several years, and a desire felt for some pretext for dissolution. The election of Mr. Lincoln is not the cause; is not the reason, it is simply the pretext.[116]

The general Northern clerical opinion concerning the State of the Union in December before the secession of South Carolina was well summarized by the *Central Christian Herald* (Presbyterian) of Cincinnati: "the country will go on pretty much as it has been going on since the election, only that the

[113]XXXVIII, No. 45, 358.
[114]XX, No. 9, 34.
[114]VIII, No. 33, 2.
[115]VIII, No. 47, 186.
[116]*Ibid.*, No. 48, 190.

excitement will gradually exhaust itself somewhat, and that our friends may dismiss any gloomy forebodings as to imminent danger, and enjoy the bounties of Providence around their firesides, in the interchange of social courtesies as in former years."[117]

The Northern Clergy thought that the Union was in no danger, and that the election aftermath would quickly subside. But, at the same time, the Clergy realized that the fire-eaters were doing their best to create and crystallize Southern public sentiment in favor of some plan that would dissolve the Union. They did not believe the Southern ultras would accomplish their designs. But all the while secession was in the making.

SECESSION AND PEACE

On November 13th the legislature of South Carolina passed a law calling a convention to consider the national emergency engulfing both State and Federal Union. South Carolina on December 20th, through the ordinance of secession, severed its relationship with the United States.

During the period of secessional gestation in South Carolina, the editor of the *New York Observer* (Presbyterian) of New York City took the position of permissive and peaceful division.

> For if Disunion comes, our voice is and shall be for Peace. . . . . If one of the States . . . . (decides) by popular expression of its will to go out of the family . . . . let her go. Let no hostile weapon be raised to arrest her career. . . . . Never, never let us plunge ourselves into civil, fratricidal war. . . . . Let the discontented member go. . . . .[118]

A peaceful settlement of the differences between the North and South was the dream of the youthful Congregational pastor, the Rev. Washington Gladden, of Morrisania, New York, who wrote in later years that "one or two sermons yellow with age, testify of a strong desire to find a better way out of the trouble than the horrible way of war. . . . ."[119]

Pacific divorce of the sections, was the position of the editor of the *Christian Watchman and Reflector* (Baptist) of Boston in December 1860. The Federal Union was not worthy of main-

[117]XII, No. 39, 154.
[118]XXXVIII, No. 47, 370.
[119]*Recollections* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1909), p. 106.

tenance if based upon new slavery compromises and guarantees, and assuredly not worth continuance at the cost of bloodshed.[120]

The duty of conciliation and compromise based on the ideals of peace and charity epitomized the contents of the official letter on the national crisis communicated by Provisional Bishop Horatio Potter of the Protestant Episcopal Church to his clergy and laity of the New York diocese in December.[121]

On December 20th, the very day the secession die was cast, the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago discussed the probabilities and possibilities of secession. If the movement were a calm and deliberate purpose of the great mass of the Southern people to destroy the Union and if they were able by coercion to accomplish that desire, then the Federal Government might as well yield at once and sign a treaty of recognition in a peaceful manner. But the editor doubted that the Southern people were in agreement concerning secession, and was sure that they would not be able to 'take their stand' victoriously. The moral effect of permitting secession would be disorganizing to the North. He added some strong words of advice to Northern Christendom: "Let no Christian Church, or minister, or religious paper at the North, 'give aid and comfort to traitors.' "[122]

The possibility of a separation of the States was most optimistically considered December 26th by the editor of the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago. He counseled:

> There is no reason to despair. . . . . Unless the Union can be preserved on principles of righteousness, let it perish. . . . . We deprecate disunion, but we think that the South is the only party in this case that has cause to fear it. The North can be a great and powerful republic by itself.[123]

Although convinced that secession would be merely temporary, the editor of the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston insisted that the dissolution be peaceful. Revolutions should be bloodless in the case of freemen and Christians.[124]

The conciliatory attitude of some of the New York Clergy in the national emergency drew the fire of the *Christian Advocate*

[120] XLI, No. 50, 2.
[121] *Protestant Churchman* (New York), XVIII, No. 31, 244.
[122] VIII, No. 38, 2.
[123] VIII, No. 19, 3.
[124] XXXIX, No. 52, 206.

and Journal (Methodist) of that city. What particularly peeved the editor was the fact that many pastors included the North as well as the South in placing the blame for the national mess. He was gratified that politics was no longer banned from the pulpit but their pulpit politics lacked "breadth and comprehensiveness of view as to the causes of agitation," and failed "to indicate the remedy." While Beecher and Tyng did not lay the chief strife-guilt upon the North, there were others who arraigned the North and still preached the Fugitive Slave remedies and compromises. There would be no permanent peace until the practice of slavery was abolished.[125]

Two of the divines undoubtedly referred to in the foregoing editorial were Dr. Adams of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church and Dr. Gallaudet of St. Anne's Protestant Episcopal Church, both of New York City. The former had preached in January 1861 that the North must cease branding the South as sinful, and advise the South to rely upon constitutional rights and not take untenable ground. The South must "not put the torch to that edifice which we occupy and hold in common. . . ."[126] Dr. Gallaudet centered his attention upon the North sadly stating that freedom of speech had been turned into licentiousness, and that "every thought, and whim and notion, and ism, ... has been blazoned upon the pages of the eager press. . . . . Extreme notions are worked up into principles . . . . the people of the country have talked too much."[127]

An open letter from the Protestant Clergy of New York was addressed January 1, 1861 to the *Presbyterian Herald* of Louisville, Kentucky; among them were, the rector of Grace Episcopal, the pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, the secretary of the American Bible Society, the president of Princeton College, the ministers of the Baptist Tabernacle, the Collegiate Reformed and Methodist Episcopal Churches. Addressing the Clergy and the Laity of Southern Christendom the Northern pulpit leaders of the metropolis declared the cause of imminent revolution was mutual sectional misrepresentation largely propagated by the pulpit and the press. In the name and for the sake of the Federal Union and the cause of Protestant Chris-

[125] XXXV, No. 51, 201.
[126] *Presbyterian Herald* (Louisville), XXX, No. 31, 1.
[127] *Ibid.*

tianity, they sought a national conference in a Christian spirit, to investigate, and deal calmly with the present issues.[128]

"Civil War No Remedy for Secession" was the sermon topic of the Rev. Horace Pratt, of St. Mary's Church of Castleton, New York, January 4, 1861. The Rector was firm in his conviction that peace even at the price of the Constitution and the Union was more desirable than civil bloodshed. The nation had better violate a thousand constitutions, and the union break into two, three, and thirty-three fragments than to cut one another's throats with weapons of steel or hurl murderous missiles of death into countless happy homes.[129]

In the latter part of March 1861, the speedy and peaceful recognition of the Southern Confederacy was advised by the editor of the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago. The happy result would be the creation of a nation of twenty millions of freemen, a soil unpolluted by a single slave.[130]

In the same month his denominational brother, the editor of the *Congregationalist* of Boston, sought a peaceful settlement of the impending conflict. He would achieve it by withdrawing the troops from Fort Sumter, which would avoid a clash of arms, hold the border states in the Union, and cause the secession movement to expire. Such a course of conciliation was preferred to that of war.[131]

A pacific and legal withdrawal of the South from the North was the view of the editor of the *Friend* (Quaker) of Philadelphia in March. He raised his voice against rebellion, could fathom no reason for resistance to the authority of the Union, and deemed an appeal to war un-Christian and impolitic. The only noble and elevated remedy was a happy divorce.[132]

"Peace at any price," even after the fall of Fort Sumter, was the border-state sentiment of the *St. Louis Presbyterian*. "Better lose half the forts, duties, *everything*, and better acknowledge to the world that our boasted confederacy (Federal Union) was too insecure a compact to hold us together . . . . anything in

[128] *Presbyterian Herald* (Louisville), XXX, No. 29, 2.
[129] *The Republican Farmer* (Bridgeport), XIX, No. 1021, 4.
[130] VIII, No. 52, 2.
[131] XIII, No. 42, 2.
[132] XXXIV, No. 30, 239.

God's name, rather than redden the waters of the Potomac with the gory life-blood of brethren. . . . ."[133]

The Rev. G. F. Macgown in a letter to the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago rejoiced at the Southern secession, because the Union would become more perfect minus slaves, and the house would be less divided against itself—a purified Union.[134]

"What is left of our Country?" was the Fast Day sermon topic of Rev. George Putnam of the First Unitarian Church of Roxbury, Massachusetts, which was reported in the *Boston Traveller* and quoted by the *Christian Register* of that city.

> The Union is broken. Seven States are gone. . . . . What is left? (There remains the hope) that the breach may be healed. (If this must fail what remains) Twenty-seven States out of thirty-four—a country of a vast extent and of a vast population. . . . . Only two or three millions of free citizens gone, their places to be made good by the natural growth of the population, long before another census is taken . . . . what is lost will hardly be missed in the estimate of numbers, power, or of resources . . . . (Even if the border States all go what remains) a country the largest in the world—except perhaps Russia —of magnificent capabilities freed from that element of slavery . . . . accustomed to the republican system, and to the rule of the majority, a country strong enough to maintain order at home, and command respect abroad; with a climate favorable to material strength to industrious habits and to mental development. That is what remains.[135]

A similar view was shared by the Rev. J. H. Morison of the Unitarian Church of Milton, Massachusetts.

> All the Gulf States, nay, all the Slave States, may leave us, and if we are left only sound in our principles, we shall, in less than twenty years, be a far more powerful nation than we ever have been yet. In numbers, in wealth, ... we shall be greater; and in moral power we shall be without the one source of internal irritation and weakness, which is at war, not only with the fundamental axioms of a free government, but with the whole spirit and tendency of our modern civilization—with its literature, its philosophy, its Christian sentiment, and its practical philanthropy. . . . .[136]

[133] Quoted by *Presbyterian Herald* (Louisville), XXX, No. 44, 11.
[134] IX, No. 2, 1.
[135] XL, No. 15, 57.
[136] *Ibid.*, No. 16, 61.

The Christian Watchman and Reflector (Baptist) boldly championed peace, conciliation, and negotiation with the Southern States to the bitter end. After the surrender of Sumter and Lincoln's call for troops the pacifist position appeared hopeless, and the editor sadly revealed his hopeless task. "We bitterly deplore the necessity of war. . . . . We have counseled forbearance till it has ceased to be a virtue. . . . . Civil war is now inevitable."[137]

The Northern Clergy supported a powerful drive for peace, some to preserve the Union, some to avoid the losses of war, some to safeguard Protestanism, and some to purify the Union by permitting the South to leave uncoerced.

SECESSION AND COERCION

The position of the Northern Clergy concerning the use of force in the era of secession before the outbreak of hostilities was first prophetic in spirit, and then increasingly hortatory in character. The attitude of the Clergy toward war is treated in a following chapter.

Nine months before the "Secession Convention" began its sessions in South Carolina a warning to the South was published by the *Christian Press* of Cincinnati. The title of this editorial was "Southern Violence."

> But what Abolition fanaticism ever exceeded those repeated and notorious outrages recently committed by Southern States in the expatriation of unoffending citizens, for the mere holding of an opinion? . . . . We warn the South that this game is too serious to go on much further, without retribution. Such outrages can not be practised without alienating the North to that extent that the Union must be impossible. . . . .[138]

The warning of inevitable war was presaged by the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati on December 12, 1860. "All the evils complained of, north or south, will be augmented a thousand-fold by severing the bonds of the Union. And, what is worse, civil war will be certain to be the result at no distant period."[139]

[137]Quoted by the *Congregationalist* (Boston), April 26, 1861.

[138]V, No. 66, 314.

[139]XXVII, No. 50, 198.

The editor continued a week later:

> The dissolution of this Union can not be a peacable affair. Civil war is as certain to follow secession as darkness to follow the going down of the sun. There are a thousand things to precipitate it. . . . . We regret to say that, in our humble opinion, the dangers which threaten the Union of these states is greater now than at any former period in our history. . . . .[140]

"Our National Crimes and Follies" was the sermon subject of Dr. Joseph P. Thompson of Broadway Tabernacle (Congregational) of New York City, January 4, 1861. He thus reviewed the state of the Union in the light of the clerical position on slavery: "Such have been the warnings of this pulpit for fifteen years. Such too, have been the warnings of thousands of pulpits throughout the land. The very peril now upon us has long been foretold."[141]

Sermons for Revolutionary Times was the timely title of a significant compilation of sermons by leading Northern and Southern pulpit thinkers and orators. The reviewer was of the opinion that this volume would "have much more than the ordinary interest of sermons."[142] "It is composed of the most marked Discourses called forth by the present state of the country," he said; "it will comprise the opposite extremes of opinion—the South as well as the North being fully represented. . . . . "[143] The reviewer then mentioned the clerical contributors to the book and their typical sermons, and maintained throughout his critique a judicial attitude.

> It will embrace the strong Disunion sermons of Dr. Thornwell, of South Carolina, and Dr. Palmer of New Orleans—the stern rebuke to secession by Dr. Breckenridge. . . . . Of the ministers of the different denominations at the North, Rabbi Raphael argues learnedly for Hebrew Slavery, and Mr. Van Dyke pours out his fierce denunciations of the Character and Influence of Abolitionism. . . . . Dr. Vinton, too, the accomplished minister of Trinity, in stately and flowing speech, reproves the fanatical spirit of the North, while on the other hand, Dr. Beecher, in sledge-hammer style, sets forth the irrepressible conflict, and Dr. Bellows argues that the present style is nothing more nor less than war between Civiliza-

[140] XXVII., No. 51, 102.
[141] (New York: Thomas Holman, 1861), p. 16.
[142] *The Evangelist* (New York), XXXII, No. 3, 1.
[143] *Ibid.*

> tion and Barbarism . . . . (the book) winds up with a middle ground discourse by Rev. Dr. Adams, of this city, a pastor who always loves to preach conciliation and peace, and who, while he describes with sad fidelity the present agitation, and alarm, closes with words of trust and hope.[144]

This book is a splendid illustration of the difference of clerical opinion between the Northern and Southern ministers, but also a diversity of conviction among the Northern pastors themselves.

On January 17, 1861, an article on "The Crisis" by Dr. Foster appeared in the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York City. This article was written at the request of the editor who commented upon it in the same issue. Dr. Foster believed that since treason had been committed, the Federal Government must have the will and the power to resist, that its own existence be vindicated, but that all peaceful means consistent with civic morality and the Constitution be exhausted before war is declared.[145] The editor while previously sympathizing with the South transformed his sentiments into indignation when secession occurred. He no doubt represented large numbers of the clergy whose kindly feelings toward the South vanished in the face of the dissolution of the Federal Union. The nation, unified and strong, appeared as much greater and more significant than even the social issue of slavery.[146]

The "irrepressible conflict" of truth and falsehood, and of right and wrong, was the central idea of the sermon delivered January 27, 1861, by the Rev. Nathaniel Hall in the First Congregational Church of Dorchester, Massachusetts. The conflict moved not simply in the economic, financial, commercial and political realms, but also in the highest of all spheres, the moral, the ethical, the religious, and the spiritual. When the principles of God, Christ, Christianity, the Church, and Religion enter the national scene, through clerical Gospel interpretation, the conflict enters the stage of irrepressibility and irresistibility.[147]

In February 1861 the Rev. C. S. Henry (Episcopal) of Newburgh, New York, wrote to a U. S. Senator that he trusted in

[144] *The Evangelist* (New York), XXXII, No. 3, 1.
[145] XXXVI, No. 3, 17.
[146] *Ibid.*
[147] *Truth Not To Be Overthrown, nor Silenced* (Boston: John Wilson & Son, 1861), p. 18.

God that the Republicans would not surrender to the Southern secessionists.[148]

The national emergency was placed in a world setting by the editor of the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* in May 1861. It is an irrepressible conflict between slavery and freedom. The editor saw the events of the hour in historical perspective. He discerned that

> Looking back, over fifty years of our history, we can now see how inevitable a collision has been preparing. . . . . With us the contest is already begun, the opposing principles of freedom and slavery have grappled. It is a struggle, on each side, for its very existence.[149]

Secession was discussed and secessionists were condemned by Northern ministers after the war was in progress. Two examples will suffice: the one, a Methodist church service in May 1861, and the other, religious magazine articles by a Presbyterian leader.

The Rev. Wesley Smith of the Fourth Street Methodist Episcopal Church of Wheeling (West Virginia) on May 9, 1861, is reported to "have delivered a very patriotic sermon."

> The Stars and Stripes hung in graceful folds around the pulpit. . . . . The pastor said he would hold no fellowship with traitors. He did not want a secessionist to sit in his church; if there was a traitor in the house, he wanted him to leave. The Government must be sustained and the rebellion put down. . . . .[150]

In a series of articles the Rev. Samuel T. Spear defined secession as "rebellion."[151] He was convinced that national loyalty must cope with rebellion not to invade the South but to defend the Constitution. "Secession as a right under the Constitution and in its accordance with its provisions, is a political heresy. . . . . It is a wicked rebellion, to be suppressed by military power, and treated as an offense against law. . . . ."[152]

Slowly but surely the idea of secession and peace was transformed into secession and coercion in the minds of many Northern clergy. There appeared to be no other way out. Secession seemed to be a threat at the very foundations of so-

[148] *Fremont (Ohio) Journal*, IX, No. 5, 1.
[149] VIII, No. 401, 2.
[150] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXVIII, No. 20, 5.
[151] *The Evangelist* (New York), XXXII, No. 27, 2.
[152] *Ibid.*, No. 29, 2.

ciety: Government, the Constitution, the Union, law and order. The Clergy put forth a mighty effort for peace. When that failed, then many and possibly most of them rallied loyally for a supreme war effort. There was a minority who dissented—through Quaker pacifist ideals, sympathy with the South, or resistance to the Administration.

CHAPTER III

The Clergy and the Southern Way of Life

THE Southern way of life, as a distinctive civilization, culture, and social order, was formulated into a concept or pattern by the more philosophic thinkers of the Northern clergy. The nature of society in the Southland, revealed in its classes, institutions, ideas, and ideals, was deemed peculiar, if not unique, to that section of the nation. The problem, therefore, is not to ascertain what the actual facts were concerning the South, but rather to discover what the clergy thought those facts were, for those clerical opinions defined and determined their resultant attitudes, and in turn, their homiletic message and personal influence.

Divergent Civilizations

In general, the South incarnated the civilization of slavery, while the North represented that of freedom, not an expedient of the moment, but a process of the centuries. Differences in time, circumstance, section, and denomination, no doubt colored and intensified the portrait the clergy painted of Southern life. But in the main, with few exceptions, a continuing clear-cut sketch of the Southern way of life is drawn from 1850 through 1865, by the ministers of such churches as: Baptist, Christian, Congregational, Episcopal, Friend, Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, Unitarian, and Universalist, from such metropolitan centers as: Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati, from such smaller cities as Hartford, Buffalo, and Chicago, and still smaller communities as: Andover and Dorchester. Massachusetts and New York frame the picture.

The State of the Nation was the Thanksgiving sermon topic in 1850 of the Rev. Theodore Parker delivered at the Melodeon in Boston. The state of the nation included an appreciation of

the figs and grapes of New England, the North, and the West; and the depreciation of the thistles and thorns of the South. A different seed had been sown in the South from that in the North and a different crop has been the result. The purpose of settlement, character of the people, and achievement of North and South reveal more differences than likenesses. The virulent opposition of Dr. Parker to slavery was now intensified by the recent passage of the Fugitive Slave Law. In his sectional comparison the Boston clergyman said:

> All the North is like New England . . . . essentially so. The West is our own daughter. The South, in the main, had a very different origin from the North . . . . few persons settled there for religion's sake; or for the sake of freedom in the State. It was not a moral idea which sent men to Virginia, Georgia, or Carolina. . . . . The difference in the seed will appear in the difference in the crop. . . . . The South with its despotic idea, dishonors labor, but wishes to compromise between its idleness and its appetite, and so kidnaps men to do its work. . . . .[1]

The Northern Iron was the Fast Day theme of April 1854, of Dr. Horace Bushnell of the North Congregational Church of Hartford, Connecticut, several weeks before the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Dr. Bushnell spoke on the same high cultural level, that characterized his master-work, "Christian Nurture," which challenged American theology and religious evangelism. He found that freedom inspired literature, and slavery degraded it. The South in comparison with the North was weak in learning, culture, art, and letters, although proficient in dining, hunting, harangue, and political skill. He said:

> The scholarship, the philosophic and esthetic culture, the originative art . . . . are barbarized of necessity by the element of slavery and make a very sorry figure in the world of letters . . . . some honorable exceptions are dinners, horses, hounds and pistols . . . . a certain power of harangue which is not oratory, and as much political skill as does not amount to statesmanship.[2]

The North, in the opinion of Dr. Bushnell, had iron; the South lacked that essential.

[1](Boston: Wm. Crosby & H. P. Nichols, 1851), pp. 12-16.

[2](Hartford: Edwin Hunt & Son, 1854), p. 21.

Within a month after John Brown led his raid on the U. S. Government arsenal at Harper's Ferry, the old Northwest spoke through the columns of the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago, warning the South that John Brown had disclosed to that section that it was living on a sleeping volcano. The editor traced historically the divergent civilizations in the nation and the inevitability of the strife. He discerned that

> This 'irrepressible conflict' began when in the same year the Mayflower landed her freemen and a Dutch ship her slaves upon our Atlantic coast. When our National Confederation was organized, there was already an active contest . . . . (slavery) was invigorated by a decoction of Cotton-Gin. . . . . The supremacy in our national life was soon gained and has been maintained to this day . . . . until by the Fugitive Bill humanity is enacted into treason, until by the Dred Scott decision Slavery is proclaimed national, and freedom sectional, so that, as in Kansas, it is obliged to live in new territory in spite of Federal persecution, and until the piracy of the slave-trade is treated by the government as such only in name. . . . . Even now the conflict thickens in its irresistibleness. . . . .[3]

Compromise appeared impossible.

Some three weeks before South Carolina passed its ordinance of secession, Dr. Henry Ward Beecher, son of President Lyman Beecher of Lane Theological Seminary (Cincinnati), and brother of Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* fame, discussed Southern philosophy in his Thanksgiving sermon of 1860 from the pulpit of Plymouth Congregational Church, Brooklyn, New York. In tracing the Northern and Southern differences back to their source in botanical and agricultural terms, he discovered the North had planted in colonial days the good seed of liberty, while the South had sown the evil seed of slavery. Now with the harvest at hand, the South desired to reap good fruit, but was about to experience a whirlwind. North and South were diametrically different.[4]

[3]VII, No. 33, 2.

[4]*Patriotic Addresses* (New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert, 1888), p. 234. ". . . . . poisonous seed was sown in colonial days. The North chose to weed it out. The South determined to cultivate it. . . . . The harvest time has now come. . . . . They sowed the wind and they are about to reap the whirlwind . . . . . It is this that convulses the South. They wish to reap the fruits of liberty from the seed of slavery. . . . . The South claims that the United States government is bound to make slavery as good as liberty for all purposes of national life. That is the root of their philosophy . . . . . The Southern States, then, have organized society around a rotten core; slavery; the North . . . . . about a vital heart: liberty. . . . . "

In a Fast Day sermon early in January 1861, Dr. Henry Whitney Bellows of the leading Unitarian Church in the metropolis, All Souls, was not even willing to admit that the South had a civilization, but rather embodied a barbarous institution, which the North was bound to sweep from the face of the earth. Dr. Bellows was the founder of the Unitarian Weekly, the *Christian Inquirer,* and later was president of the United States Sanitary Commission during the war. He denied that the power of political parties endangered slavery, but affirmed that the growth of civilization was pronouncing the doom of slavery. He realized how deep rooted the slavery system was, how it engulfed the slaveholders and colored their convictions. He would inspire hate for the economic system of slavery, but love for the helpless slaveholder. He asserted that

> it is not party power . . . . which threatens slavery. It is simply civilization in its necessary progress which is dooming it to ruin. . . . . They (slaveholders) are, for the most part, helpless victims, and their existing opinions the inevitable opinions of men in their circumstances. . . . . It is love of the slaveholder which inspires our hatred for what is ruining him. . . . . It is only between the civilization and the barbarous institution of Slavery that an irrepressible enmity exists. . . . . The real issue (is) between the Christian civilization . . . . and domestic slavery. . . . ."[5]

Again a dire chasm!

In the interval between the formation of the Southern Confederacy in February 1861 and the firing upon Fort Sumter in April, an important election sermon was delivered in early March by the Rev. Professor Austin Phelps, later president of Andover Theological Seminary .(Congregational), before the Governor of Massachusetts and State officials, at the Old South Congregational Church in Boston, the "cathedral church" of American Congregationalism. The ethical advice given by this professorial clergyman to Bay State Statesmen and politicians was direct and to the point.

> Two opposing types of civilization are in conflict here, and have been from the infancy of our Union. The conflict is not one of physical resources, but of ideas. The strifes of political parties have been, as they often are in the

[5] *Christian Inquirer* (New York City), XV, No. 16, 2.

> history of great nations, ripples on the surface of affairs. Underneath, a drifting of social forces has been going on. . . . . So that the freedom, and if the freedom, the happiness, and the culture, and the character of every man, woman, and child, of the future generations of America, swing on the pivot of the African question today. . . . . God tries nations by the conflict of ideas, brought into conflict in the exigencies of national life. . . . . Just this, then, I must believe is the mission of New England at the present juncture of affairs; it is to stand with temperate, but firm resolve, by the hereditary ideas of liberty. . . . . We owe this to the future of the South, no less than to our own. . . . .[6]

The above sermon was reported as a news item in the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago.

On April 12, 1861, at 4:30 a.m. Fort Sumter was shelled, and after a severe bombardment of thirty-six hours, was surrendered April 13th. "The Battle Set in Array" was the timely sermon-topic of Dr. Henry Ward Beecher, April 14th, at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. The heart of the message dealt with a comparison of the Southern and the Northern spirit of patriotism. He declared:

> There has been a spirit of patriotism in the North; but never, within my memory, in the South. I never heard a man from the South speak of himself as an American. Men from the South speak of themselves as Southerners. . . . . And in the South the feeling has been sectional, local. The people there have been proud, not that they belong to the nation, but that they were born where the sun burns. They are hot, narrow and boastful, for out of China there is not so much conceit as exists among them. They have been devoid of that large spirit which takes in the race, and the nation, and its institutions, and its history. . . . . The war is brought to us. . . . . I hold that it is ten thousand times better to have war than to have human slavery.[7]

Dr. Beecher was one of the founders of the *Independent* newspaper, and was editor-in-chief from 1861 to 1863. This periodical was described by the editor of the *Quarterly Church Review* (Episcopal) as having "a larger circulation and wider influence than any other professional religious newspaper in

[6] VIII, No. 49, 2.
[7] *Patriotic Addresses*, pp. 276-77.

the country." The editorial comment of the *Independent* on the national situation in August 1861 was significant. "This war is nothing else than another stage in the conflict of the ages—irreconciliable and irrepressible—between the civilization of freedom and the so-called civilization which has slavery for its basis. . . . ."[8]

Dr. Edward Everett Hale, author of *The Man Without a Country,* one of the best sellers of the Civil War era, and one which greatly strengthened the morale of the Union Cause, was also a clergyman. In the summer of 1862 he felt that the South represented a state of semi-civilization and that

> the end of the present war must be the civilization of the Southern States. It will not really end until that civilization is secured . . . . the semi-civilization of the crudest agriculture, of vassal slavery and that social order which belong to them. We are to introduce into the South and Southwest, new men, new life, and a higher civilization. . . . .[9]

In September 1863 the year of the battles of Gettysburg and Vicksburg, the Rev. J. N. Murdock (Baptist) preached a sermon at Brookline, Massachusetts, on the theme, "Two Civilizations." In historical imagination the preacher crossed the Atlantic to delve into British history to uncover the origins of American ills. He disclosed the fact that from the foundation of the nation, two antagonistic principles of life had been introduced from the Old World, and that as a result, two conflicting civilizations existed in the New World and strove mightily for mastery.[10]

Upon the basis of a three weeks inspection tour through the "slavedom" of Kentucky and Tennessee, the Rev. Nathaniel Hall, in May 1864, presented a sermonic report of his trip to his parishioners of the First Congregational Church of Dorchester, Massachusetts. He was convinced that there was an inherent difference between the civilization of the North and that of the South and he phrased his address accordingly: *The Moral Significance of the Contrasts between Slavery and Freedom.* In the South he saw an absence, more or less, of the indispensable features of civilization. The way of life was below that of any

[8](New York City), XIII, No. 664, 4.

[9]*Christian Register* (Boston), XLI, No. 34, 133.

[10]*Christian Watchman and Reflector* (Boston), XLIV, No. 38, 2. "Jamestown and Plymouth represented on these shores the antagonistic principles of Cavalier and Roundhead, and renewed here the old struggle between the chartered prerogative and imprescriptible right, which had raged for centuries, under various names and guises, in the mother isle. The Cavalier brought with him those ideas of prescription and caste which had led him to battle, from the time of the Norman conquest, for aristocracy and absolutism. The Puritan brought with him those ideas of individual freedom and equality, which. . . . . contained the germs of Republican life. . . . . "

group in New England and unthrift and wretchedness characterized especially the lower classes in the South, below the level of simple decency. This lack of refinements, comforts, and conveniences, this lack of neat, trim, and orderly dwellings and enclosures, and this lack of the appointments and furnishings of domestic life, left a depressing impression upon the mind of Mr. Hall. He said:

> It seems indeed to the Northern stranger that he has fallen back generations from the civilization he has left. It is not a mere difference in manners, habits, pursuits, speech, you notice, but of ideas as well. . . . . You seem to yourself to have come among a different nation, upon a different age; among those who have been slumbering, while the rest of the world has moved on.

In other words, Mr. Hall felt that Freedom made the North alive, thrifty, and neat; and that Slavery condemned the South to sleeping sickness, unthrift, and wretchedness. The observer was not interested simply in political, economic, and social differences, but in the moral contrasts of the Northern civilization of liberty with the Southern existence of bondage.[11]

Shortly after the assassination of President Lincoln, the Rev. Daniel C. Eddy of the Baldwin Place Congregational Church of Boston delivered an ecclesiastical philippic in which he based his estimate of Southern philosophy upon a summary of violent deeds. Slavery, barbarism, and atrocity were the key words of his sweeping indictment. His conclusion was that the South was fundamentally different from the North. He preached:

> Argue as we may, our Southern people are a difficult race. Slavery has given them a different code of morals, a different law of ethics, a different idea of religion. They have been educated under a different civilization and are another people. Slavery has barbarized them, and made them a people with whom we have little in common. We had an idea of Southern civilization when Judge Hoar was driven out of Charleston . . . . when Sumner was bleeding in the Federal Senate . . . . when ornaments were made for Southern ladies of the bones of the brave soldiers killed at Bull Run . . . . in the atrocities perpetrated upon our poor soldiers . . . . taken prisoners. . . . . And now we have another exhibition of it in the base, wanton, assassination of the President. . . . .[12]

[11](Boston: Walker, Wise, 1864), pp. 8-10.
[12]*The Martyr President* (Boston: Graves & Young, 1865), pp. 16-17.

Mr. Eddy further desired prompt action to transform this divergent civilization south of the Mason and Dixon Line.

Substituting the word character for civilization, the Rev. Phillips Brooks (later bishop), the young rector of twenty-nine, of the Holy Trinity Episcopal Church of Philadelphia, fervently compared the "two American natures" or "characters" in his Lincoln Memorial sermon, delivered the first Sunday after the death of the President.[13] A biographer of Mr. Brooks has considered this Memorial effort among his "great sermons."[14] For years the history of America had been the impending collision of these two types of American life, the true nature of the North and the false of the South.[15]

The final overthrow of Southern civilization by coercion was ably depicted by James T. Robinson in his national anniversary address in the Baptist Church at North Adams, Massachusetts, on Independence Day, 1865. Rising to an eloquent historical climax, he invoked the shades of Plymouth and Jamestown, of Puritan and of Cavalier. Now that the trial of strength was over the speaker felt that the united nation would rise to new glory and splendor. He said:

> It is over. Aristocracy and despotism are overwhelmed. The greatest conspiracy against the Free Institutions, and the progress of mankind, is annihilated. The eleventh century crumbles before the nineteenth. The Slave Ship yields to the May Flower. Plymouth conquers Jamestown. The Barbarism of the Plantation kneels to the Christian civilization of the Puritans. Once again the Cavalier flies before the Puritan, as his ancestors two hundred years before on the fields of Marston Moor, and Nasby, showed their silken backs to Cromwell. The trial and test of two hundred years is over. The great Republic, tried by fire, saddened and chastened by the conflict, but terrible and glorious, ascends through smoke and flame to unending sway and splendor.[16]

[13] *The Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln* (Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead, 1865), pp. 10-19

[14] A. V. G. Allen, *Phillips Brooks* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1907), p. 182.

[15] Phillips Brooks, *The Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln*, pp. 10-19. "There was no American character embracing the land. There were two characters, with impulses of irrepressible and deadly conflict..... The one nature.....set itself to discover new ways for the new duties..... The other nature.....set itself.....to build anew the structure of a feudalism..... The one magnified labor, the other nature depreciated and despised it. The one honored the laborer and the other scorned him..... One nature was full of the influences of Freedom, the other nature was full of the influences of Slavery..... One was the Spirit of the North, the other was the Spirit of the South. The history of our country for many years is the history of how these two elements of American life approached collision..... It was the conflict of the two American natures, the false and the true....."

[16] *National Anniversary Address* (North Adams, Massachusetts: W. H. Phillips, 1865), pp. 16-19.

The orator concluded with eight prophetic words: "Now comes the trial of Peace and Reconstruction."[17]

The Rev. Alonzo Quint, Congregational Chaplain in the Civil War, leading denominational authority on Polity, and prolific news commentator on war themes, shared the views of Mr. Robinson in his election sermon in Boston early in January of 1866. "Massachusetts ideas," he affirmed,

> spread over the North; went with its emigrants over the great North-west; and came in conflict with the despotism of the slaveholder. . . . . When the glittering chivalry of the Southerner dashed against the iron race, it splintered like glass. No wonder the Richmond editor, during the war, wished that the pestilent Mayflower had sunk in mid-ocean with all its freight. . . . ."

While the war was over, officially, from the military standpoint, Mr. Quint believed that "the conflict of ideas" was not over and that "the doctrine of equal rights has still to be maintained against prejudice, pride, and a mistaken interest. . . . ."[18]

Probably this idea of divergent civilizations, the North so utterly unlike the South, played its part in the complexes of irrepressibility and irresistibility, in the sectional strife of the age. The Northern Clergy in the creation and nurture of public opinion radiated an emotionalized idea of divergency.

THE SOUTHERN SOCIAL ORDER OF CASTE

Southern civilization was thought to be dominated by an aristocratic oligarchy, a wealthy slave-owning caste, to which all other classes in every phase of life, were subservient. This aristocracy deemed itself superior to all Northerners, as well as all Southerners, an assumption particularly galling to many of the Clergy living north of the Mason and Dixon Line.

That this caste controlled the politics of the South and purposed to direct national affairs as well was the contention of the Rev. Eden B. Foster in a sermon delivered in the John Street Congregational Church of Lowell, Massachusetts, in June 1854. The Kansas-Nebraska Bill had become a law on May 30th, an event that stirred many Northern Clergy to their homiletic depths or heights. These gentlemen of leisure were arrogant,

[17] *National Anniversary Address* (North Adams, Massachusetts: W. H. Phillips, 1865), pp. 16-19.

[18] *Annual Election Sermon* (Boston: Wright & Potter, 1866), pp. 39-41.

parasitic politicians.[19] The warning title of Mr. Foster's sermon was "Perils of Freedom."

To Mr. Foster's concept of the Southern planter slave-owner as an indolent politician, the editor of the *Churchman* (Episcopal) of New York City, in May 1861, added a colorful, re-characterization of that Southern master as a person of mixed qualities, a "fine, generous, overbearing, proud, pugnacious character whose good qualities, which are neither few nor small, are to a great extent, eclipsed by his domineering and boastful manner. . . . ."[20]

That the Southern leader was virtually a feudal lord was the thought conveyed by the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York, in contrasting the Northern social order of equality and democracy with the inequality and caste of Southern society.

> The Southern colonies were planted more by adventurers representing the Norman idea (feudalism), and with them a body of followers dependent and also servile. . . . . Southern Society, then, and always had these two extremes — the high-toned gentlemen whose favorite political idea has been that of aristocracy and absolutism, and a miserable rabble without enterprise and wretched in the extreme; but the democratic equality which characterizes the North they have known nothing about. . . . . This conquest of theirs which was exhausted in England by the triumph of the Anglo-Saxon ideas, was transferred to this continent. A portion of the Southern people shared this democratic idea, but it never *ruled* there. . . . .[21]

Thus the Norman feudalistic principle of class overlordship ruled the South from colonial inception and was in secure permanent control.

The two-class idea was also shared by O. J. Wait, writing in the *Christian Palladium* (Christian) of New York. "The South

[19] *The Rights of the Pulpit and Perils of Freedom. Two Discourses* (Lowell: J. J. Judkins, 1854), pp. 45-57. ". . . . . the men of the South—the educated, the genteel, the aristocratic—are politicians from their childhood up. It is their study by day and their dream by night to attain office and honor in the general government, and to gain control of national affairs. They have nothing else to do. Work is not in their line—their plantations take care of them and theirs. Agriculture, manufactures, trade, are to them ignoble employments—They were not born to toil. . . . . They are gentlemen at large. . . . . They are guardians of the nation. . . . . Politics is their business and politics their rest. . . . . politics their study and politics their play, politics their meat and politics their drink. . . . . They have furnished more presidents, more cabinet officers, more executive and judicial incumbents, more diplomatic charges and plenipotentiaries, more exalted functionaries of every kind than the North. . . . . "

[20] (New York), XXXI, No. 5, 32-33.

[21] XXXVI, No. 23, 180.

is divided into two great classes—the lords and the slaves," asserted the writer. The lords symbolized "aristocracy" while "poverty" was the badge of the slave. As for the poor white, in a slave state, "he is put as low or even lower than the slave," the border states excepted. Thus a middle class is virtually excluded from the Southern social order.[22]

The Rev. S. T. Spear in an article in the *Evangelist* (New School Presbyterian) of New York, included in his exposition, the usual concepts of feudalism, aristocracy, planter-dominance, and political control. The Southern States differed from the Northern in not being pure democracies but having at their heart the essence of feudalism. The planter slave-holder class dominates that section, politically, socially and economically. They are aristocratic patricians, the lords of the manor of slavery, and share the typical attitudes of superiority toward other classes, especially their slaves. The existence of a distinct middle class is virtually ignored.[23] Mr. Spear thus saw the planter slave-owner as the feudal lord who wielded power supremely in the political realm, but who also controlled the social and economic life as well.

The Independent of New York editorially in 1861 presented a penetrating and comparative analysis of Northern and Southern social orders, contrasting the labor systems, the educational policy, the sectional cultures and forms of religion. In the social order of the North "thought and utterance are free, and law spreads its equal protection over every human individual (while the South) regards the states as existing not for the equal benefit of all, but for the benefit of a dominant class, and under which innocent men are compelled to labor without wage. . . . ."[24] Then the editor discussed the relationship of a slave economic order to law, learning, and Christianity. In the North

[22]XXX, No. 28, 214.

[23]XXXII, No. 31, 6. "The *Southern* Republics are not pure democracies. They contain in their bosom the feudal system in its very worst form embodied in a class of men denominated slaveholders. . . . . an aristocratic order. . . . . courteous toward equals, generous in their hospitality, sensitive as to their honor, imperious in their bearing, unaccustomed to labor, regarding labor as a badge of servility, having but little sympathy with the doctrine of popular rights, clamorous and very tenacious of their special privileges, and always ready for deeds of chivalry, all aristocratic classes form an order of men by themselves, born to command, but not to obey. Such, essentially, is the position of the slave-holding order of men at the South, especially the large planters. By education, interest, and habit, they are devoted to their peculiar institution. Slavery and cotton are their two principal ideas. They are the men, in the main who form the South. As to practical ploicy, they *are* the South. They give to Southern society their own ideas. . . . . They, nevertheless, are the ruling class. They attend to the politics of the South; they manage its government, and fill the places of public honor. . . . . "

[24]XIII, No. 664, 4.

legislation was based on the idea of human equality, in the South inequality; in the North public education for the many, in the South for the few; in the North a free religion faced the forces of evil, and in the South, an enslaved religion, bound to the economic *status quo*. In plain speech, the social order of the South was characterized by special privilege, social inequality, economic monopoly, educational retardation, cultural sterility, and religious subservience.[25]

The war years of 1861, 1862, and 1863 intervened and in 1864 the *Independent* published a critical analysis of Southern racial origins, with special reference to the First Families of Feudalism, as of under-world ancestry. While many nationalities mingled in both the Northern and Southern colonies in early days, the riff raff of Europe wended their way southward. Southern aristocracy, therefore, shields a most unsavory lineage.

> The aristocracy, therefore, which maintains its descent from brothels and bridewells, is welcome to the savor of such a lineage. . . . . We know that Southern aristocracy is not synonymous with comfort, thrift, cleanliness, and usefulness, honesty, decency, or common humanity: we have learned to recognize it by the opposite of these traits. . . . .[26]

"Quintus," the Congregational news-commentator, in an article from the army in the field to the *Western Christian Advocate*, in the spring of 1864, treated at some length such groups in the Southern social order as the "poor whites," the "white trash," and the "middle class." He made a careful distinction between these two "poor" groups, noting that the "white trash" compose a class by themselves, that they are unhealthy, under-nourished, unintelligent, illiterate, shiftless,

[25]XIII, No. 664, 4. "On the one side of that line, the fundamental idea of legislation, in the states, is that principle of human equality, on the other side, Christian devotion takes the form of gratitude to that divine benignity which has considerately created negroes for the very purpose of relieving white men from the degradation of labor. On the one side, every state has its system of public instruction not only for the few but for the many . . . . . On the other side, ignorance of the degraded laboring class, is established by law, and guarded by penalties. On the one side, free labor, intelligent and skillful, is creating and accumulating wealth . . . . . on the other, the toil of brutish drudges impelled by fear, produces wealth only by the accidental and temporary monoply of a single product . . . . . On the one side the progress of a civilization is producing historians, poets, artists, inventors, and philosophers. On the other there is no lack of native talent, and no lack of leisure in the ruling class; but how little has there been of such contributions to the intellectual wealth of our common country. On the one side, a free Christianity is grappling with every form of evil . . . . . on the other the enslaved Christianity . . . . . is put to the ignominious task of holding forth a divine warrant for 'slavery as it is' . . . . . "

[26]*Ibid.*, XVI, No. 790, 4.

ambition-less, and given to profanity, tobacco, drink, and fighting.[27]

Leaving the "white trash" an unsolved problem, "Quintus" turned to the class of "poor whites" which he found more or less isolated, held in disdain by the dominant slaveholding class, and lacking ambition. There were some energetic "poor whites" who migrated to the Northern cities to try their luck, thus weakening the group back home, as a social unit. Upon this class the writer felt sure, the North must rely in reorganizing the institutions of the South. He located the "poor whites" in those portions where wealth is not rapidly produced . . . . the settlements are neighborhoods . . . . necessarily small and isolated . . . . held in more or less contempt by the slaveholder, they lack the ambition to rise in the world . . . . and are continually weakened by losing the energetic men, who go to the cities to seek new fortunes in the free states. . . . ."[28] As for the middle class, the reporter found only a slight trace of it in the cities. The middle class could not arise because the enterprising men who enter the professions or become substantial business men, ally and identify themselves with the slave aristocracy and acquire plantations, themselves.[29]

Several months later the same writer in the same paper, recorded his findings concerning the "Southern Women." Dismissing the Southern claim that womanhood in that section was elevated to the highest position on earth, in comparison with that of the North, or any foreign land, "Quintus" believed that the true character of Southern womanhood could only be understood by viewing it in relation to the slave woman. He

[27](Cincinnati), XXXI, No. 18, 138. "They are found in every portion of the South, but nowhere in large numbers. You come in contact with them in the outskirts of the towns, on old wornout plantations, and in the woods in the vicinity of the large and rich neighborhoods. There is an air of worthlessness and conscious degradation about their weather-beaten cabins. . . . . I have never seen among them a single mark of pride, industry, thrift, or honor; and they always suffer in comparison with the negroes of the same district. . . . . They have a strange unhealthy, sallowness of complexion, weak or inflamed eyes, flat chests, and round shoulders. But what fixes your attention is the lack of intelligence and energy which reigns in the household. . . . . Not one of them can read; they know nothing at all of the world, they have no ambition, no desires to better their condition. Men, women, and children both smoke and chew tobacco, drink whiskey, fight, swear, and practice all the inexpensive vices. . . . . "

[28]*Ibid.*

[29]*Ibid.* "Everywhere the man of spirit or energy comes from abroad, or rises in the midst of them whether he is ambitious of wealth, political, or literary position, as soon as possible identifies himself with the slave aristocracy. . . . . generally lawyers, preachers, merchants, and manufacturers are owners of slave plantations. . . . . "

had in mind the Southern woman to the manor born, rather than to the cottage or cabin. He felt that the slave woman, white master, and southern mistress were all degraded by the presence of slavery, conspicuously a moral disintegration.[30]

"Quintus" found the attitude of Southern women toward taking an oath of allegiance to the North most unethical, that they attached no sacredness to the pledge, and boasted that they intended to violate it.[31] He summarized his views of Southern Society:

> The more I see of Southern society, the more I am satisfied that it was rotten to the core. . . . . The idea of virtue has nearly died out; honesty was at a discount . . . . faith was looked upon as a weakness, and the worst features of barbarism have made our blood run cold, as at Fort Pillow . . . . the fair ones who have purchased ease and culture at the price of their degradation, will have paid to them measure for measure. . . . .[32]

Returning from the front, "Quintus" resumed his clerical name of the Rev. Alonzo H. Quint, Congregational minister, from Massachusetts. On April 16, 1865, the day after the death of President Lincoln, he spoke on the theme: *Southern Chivalry, and What the Nation Ought to Do With It,* at the North Congregational Church of New Bedford, Massachusetts. After setting up the romantic concept of the Southern gentleman, Dr. Quint proceeded to riddle it by a realistically recolored portrait. Instead of the noble, generous, hospitable, patriarchal protector, gentleman, and statesman, Mr. Quint sketched a revengeful, treacherous, murderous liar and cheat. Therefore, according to this New England clerical observer, the Southern gentleman, planter slave-owner, was iniquitous in theory and in practice, in idea and in deed. Such comprehensive analyses of Southern

[30]No. 29, 225. "The degradation of the slave woman has been sedulously hidden from the North. . . . . The ladies of the South consented to all this. . . . . saw their husbands and sons polluting soul and body, degrading honorable blood and pure domestic traditions, and held their peace, because the slave woman was. . . . . made to relieve her from daily physical toil. . . . . So you find the Southern woman proud and arrogant, and nearly always prating about her character and assuring you that she is a lady. . . . . I am speaking of the class who are slave-holders, and live in mansions, not of the humbler class, who have more of the usual virtues of their sex. . . . . "

[31]*Ibid.*

[32]*Ibid.*

society are rare among clerical writers, although brief characterizations are frequent.[53]

THE SOUTHERN BARBAROUS SLAVOCRACY

The peculiar nature of the institution of negro slavery, and its effect upon the attitudes and morals of Southern society, provided abundant material for the Northern Clergy in shaping and crystalizing this phase of the Southern way of life.

The Southern Plantation System was severely condemned in June 1854 by the Rev. Eden B. Foster of the John Street Congregational Church of Lowell, Massachusetts. Inherent in the system were such evils as cruelty, ignorance, immorality and sin.[54]

The degrading effect of slavery upon the slave-holder, and upon law and order, was discussed in April 1861 by the Rev. T. B. Turner, pastor of the Warren Street Universalist Church of Boston. In speaking of the slave-owner Mr. Turner asserted:

> He treats his equals as his inferiors, and is as overbearing and insolent to them as to his slaves. The pistol, the bowie knife, the bludgeon, are his constant companions, and the emblems of his social condition; and the scenes in Congress, and the fearful street forays, and the murderous attacks on personal enemies . . . . the necessary social tendency of Slavery is to the lowest forms of civilization. . . . .[55]

[53](New Bedford, Massachusetts: Mercury Job Press, 1865), pp. 31-35. "It was long the feeling that a Southern Gentleman was the perfection of humanity. He was a noble, generous man, above mean and petty acts. He was no Yankee, to love a dollar. A kind of patriarchal protector, in his lordly mansion, to the attached and happy servants, who could not take care of themselves. Rather passionate, but that was the natural fault of high-toned feeling. In government he took offices not for money, but because he was educated for statesmanship. . . . . It took time to find out that this was a delusion, that he was, with exceptions of course, revengeful, treacherous, murderous. That he was a liar, and a cheat. That he loved money dearly and wrung it out of the tears of his bondsmen. That his lordly mansion was nine times in ten, unfit for a sty for northern pigs. That his slaves were chained, and whipped and branded. That his statesmanship was mere craft, to get salaries on the one hand, and, on the other, to enable him to get and to keep more negroes. That he was lazy, and selfish, and often stupidly ignorant. That his hospitality always wanted pay for the wayfarer's dinner, except when his ruling principle, vanity, prevented. . . . . The Southern gentleman lives by robbing. His property, when he is a slave-master, is robbery in itself. He makes men work without adequate wages. . . . . To rule without law is another characteristic. . . . . Hence with unrestrained passions, licentiousness is inevitable. . . . . To kill without law, is another prerogative. . . . . Without law, it is not a strange thing to carry pistols and bowie knives; assassinate in houses and streets; lynch men who happen to think differently. . . . . "

[54]*The Rights of the Pulpit and the Perils of the Nation, Two Discourses* (Lowell: J. J. Judkins, 1854), pp. 34-35. "Look at the system of plantation cruelty at the South. As a system it is one of domineering despotism containing all the elements of the most intolerable tyranny, rendering liberty and life insecure, governing by fear of bodily torture, substituting brute force for the rule of reason, leading on necessarily to personal combats and bloody, bold, noonday assassinations even among the white race . . . . taking away the key of knowledge . . . . compelling the ignorance of the slave . . . . rending family ties, parting husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, lovers and their betrothed . . . . making the family relationships a perfect nullity . . . . introducing unchaste license and profligate vices . . . . disfranchisement of free labor and the subjugation of free territory . . . . a system begun in wrong and perpetuated in sin."

[55]*The Trumpet and Universalist Magazine* (Boston), XXXIII, No. 49, 193.

He saw, also, the widespread evils of slavery in its effect upon the other classes of the South. He declared that slavery not only brutalized the owner, it also degraded "the artisan and mechanic class. . . . . It discourages the merchant and manufacturer . . . . it surely shuts out the master and owner from the noblest civilization."[36] The charge in this instance is that slavery was an economic blight upon every class of Southern society.

The Churchman (Episcopal) of New York City, editorially, by implication, in May 1861, suggested the relationship of slavery to public morals, that the tendency of Southerners both individually and collectively was "to duelling and personal encounters," and that "tarring and feathering, and popular violence generally are almost entirely confined to the South. . . . ."[37]

The menace of slavery to society as well as to the slaveowner, was asserted in an article by the Rev. S. T. Spear in the *Evangelist* (Presbyterian) of New York City in the summer of 1861. (The slave population) "must be taught to submit to the authority of a despotic will. . . . . They must be looked upon, and in many respects treated, as if they were a hostile population. . . . ."[38]

The dangers of Southern Slavocracy were comprehensively epitomized by Dr. Joseph P. Thompson, pastor of the leading Congregational Church of New York City, Broadway Tabernacle, from 1845 to 1871, and one of the founders of the *Independent*, the outstanding religious paper of the North. The Southern economic order created and maintained four classes, harmful to freedom: (1) The enslaved population, increasing in numbers, in the awareness of the wrong endured, and in the purpose of revenge; (2) the turbulent common people, ripe for tumult, and ready tools of designing men; (3) the slaveholders, ever dangerous to liberty, and (4) the politicians, of the serpentine school, wearing the badge of slavocracy.[39]

[36] *The Trumpet and Universalist Magazine* (Boston), XXXIII, No. 49, 193.

[37] XXXI, No. 5, 32-33.

[38] XXXII, No. 31, 6.

[39] The *Independent* (New York), XIII, No. 658, 4-5.

"The Barbarism of Slavery" was the subject of an article which appeared in the *Advocate* (Methodist) of Buffalo in the autumn of 1861. The author was convinced that slavery would cause white civilization to decline and fall, causing a return to the dark ages. The writer luridly portrayed the cruelty, the inhumanity, and the brutalization of slavery. The brutal deeds of the slave-owner thus inevitably debased the character of master, children, and the social order.[40]

The Rev. W. S. Philips of Wethersfield, Connecticut, added his personal testimony concerning the iniquity of slavery. On the 13th of July, 1862, he sailed for Port Royal, having received a commission in the Freedmen's Relief Association. In September 1862 from St. Helena Island, South Carolina, he wrote his experiences to a Connecticut religious journal:

> I have had an opportunity of learning what slavery is since I have been here. I see thousands of all ages who can neither read nor write; I see hundreds of families whose heads have never been married according to the laws of God and man, and the marriage relation treated as a thing of naught; I see daily scores of illegitimate children; I see the iron yoke and shackle which were used by the slave-holder to gall and confine the slave; I see the scars of cruelty upon the features and limbs of the contrabands, and say, O, monster slavery, these are only a few of thy bitter fruits! The tendency of the whole situation is to licentiousness, ignorance, and murder. . . . .[41]

The decline of Southern morals was treated by the editor of the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston in the autumn of 1862. Southern morals had been on the down grade for fifty years attended by race domination, restriction of general education, disdain for common labor, and slavery extension until the nation was in the deadening grip of the Slavocracy.[42]

A slashing attack upon the morals of Southern planters was launched by Chaplain N. L. Brakeman of the 21st Indiana Regi-

[40]XII, No. 609, 1. ". . . . . men who pursue their brothers with bloodhounds, who sell maidens at auction, who flog naked women and girls, as regardless of their presence as if they were dogs, who practice all inhumanities of manacles, whippings, and burnings at the stake, which are necessary to keep in subjection a brutalized and crushed race, must become barbarian—they and their children of necessity lapse into a semi-civilized state."

[41]*Christian Secretary* (Hartford), XLI, No. 2111, 2.

[42]XLI, No. 41, 161. "For the last half century the moral course of the Southern leaders has been downward. By the habit of domination over a subject race, all respect for any but the governing class has been obliterated. Enmity to the education of the masses, contempt for honest labor, and determination to extend the slave institution till it controlled the nation, have been the leading characteristics and purposes of Southern leaders."

ment, in a letter to the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) in 1863. He discovered that numerous gambling towns existed in the South, owned by the planters of means. The planters lived beyond their means and were in constant debt to commission merchants and others. The morals of the planters and the prodigal son in Holy Writ were identical. Such immoral persons naturally despised decency, purity, and honesty. Chaplain Brakeman wrote:

> Small towns do not flourish in the South, and are generally little "cities of the plain" for iniquity, which is perfectly natural, since the entire South is but a magnificent Sodom. . . . . Planters are generally the proprietors of these little towns, and also the principal players and patrons at the gaming tables and drinking holes. In these diminutive sinks of great sins, money by the thousands, slaves, and even entire plantations . . . . have changed hands. . . . . Planters are "prodigal sons," who spend their substance with harlots and in riotous living. . . . . They must despise humble virtue, honorable labor, real worth, moral excellence, and intellectual superiority. . . . .[43]

The Mistakes of the Rebellion was the sermon-topic of the Rev. Alexander H. Vinton, Rector of St. Marks Church-in-the-Bowerie (Episcopal), New York City, at the Thanksgiving service of 1863. He felt that the characteristics of the Southern people determined the state of mind of the South. They were:

> not largely educated . . . . grown up in the indolence of absolute power, despised the labor . . . . which lay at the foundation of our mechanical, manufacturing, commercial, and educational success. . . . . Accustomed to act from whim, from passion, or from will . . . . they had no conception of a principle as supreme above impulse . . . . a code which exalted the sentimental graces . . . . which frowned upon an insult, but warranted an injustice . . . . which taught him to be gallant, and permitted him to be unchaste, to be polished in manner and rotten in conscience, generous yet grasping, hospitable yet cruel, at the pleasure of his passions, courtly in the saloon and savage in the courtyard. . . . .[44]

Dr. Vinton had been the pastor of Phillips Brooks in Boston,

[43](Cincinnati), XXX, No. 11, 82. "But industry and economy are strangers here, and the planter with all his wealth, possession and pride, is far from being truly independent: he lives in advance of his means and the commission merchant and others have a lien upon his possessions so that he can hardly call it his own. . . . . "

[44](New York: George F. Nesbitt, 1863), p. 28.

and had a profound influence upon him in his formative years.[45] He was one of the leading, if not the outstanding preacher in the Episcopal Church in that era, and also influential in its deliberative councils.[46]

"Different habits and customs which grow naturally out of the different systems of Free and Slave labor" was the suggestive idea from the Episcopal journal, the *American Quarterly Church Review*, of New York in an article published in 1864.[47]

Many Northern clergymen firmly believed that the Southern social order was profoundly influenced by the slavocracy, that the ethics and morals of the planter slave-owner were largely molded by the labor system of slavery. An incisive portrayal of the far reaching effects of slavery upon both South and North was written by the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York in 1864. Slavery had corrupted and brutalized the conscience of that section, had inflamed the lust of domination, and had developed an intolerance toward opposition which resulted in vindictive spite toward the North. The South for years had boasted its superiority over the North, and was thoroughly enraged when the North denied that assumption. The editor stated: "The Southerners have long lived in the conviction that the Northern people were a mean, spiritless, and mercenary race, utterly unworthy to be joined in terms of equality with themselves. . . . ."[48] Southern white racial supremacy created not only a superiority complex with reference to negroes, but also toward Northern whites as well.

The Rev. Phillips Brooks in his Lincoln Memorial sermon in 1865, preached at the Episcopal Church of the Holy Trinity in Philadelphia, declared:

> Slavery was a barbarian institution. . . . . The same spirit which was blind to the wickedness of breaking sacred ties, of separating man and wife, of beating women till they dropped down dead, of organizing licentiousness and sin into commercial systems, of forbidding knowledge and protecting itself with ignorance, of putting on its arms and riding out to steal a state at the beleagured ballot-box away from Freedom . . . . the spirit that gave

[45] C. C. Tiffany, *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America* (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895), p. 544.

[46] A. V. G. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[47] XV, No. 4, 541-75.

[48] XXXIX, No. 48, 380.

> man the ownership of man in time of peace has found out yet more terrible barbarisms for the time of war. . . . .[49]

The Southern barbarous slavocracy as a term, a phrase, a symbol became for the Northern Clergy a vicious demon, a diabolical devil, and an insidious iniquity—to be cast out of the life of the American people, both North and South, for its influences had spread throughout the United States as well as the former confederacy.

THE APOSTATE RELIGION OF THE SOUTH

Southern Christianity, or the theological and ethical position of Southern Christian Churches, was thoroughly orthodox. Religion in the South, by and large, supported the civilization, culture, and social order south of the Mason and Dixon Line. To the Northern clergy in most instances, such support was deemed servility and subserviency to the *status quo* in the body politic; while to the Southern Ministry, their position was supreme loyalty and devotion. The Northern Clergy, at home in their own realm of religion, ably probed the faith of their clerical brethren across the sectional border.

A survey of Southern Christianity was set forth in an editorial in the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston in 1857. The Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists are the only denominations referred to by name.

> . . . . the least offensive of Protestant denominations at the South is the high and dry Episcopal Church, so conservative, is ecclesiastically established that it can take little notice of what is politically or socially unjust. Next in acceptance comes the widespread Presbyterian fold, not much more republican in polity, but still oligarchic and semi-prelatic. . . . . The humbler and more democratic sects recede in the same proportion from Rome and from the mad enthusiasm for slavery. The Methodists, when they pretend to bishops, are most in favor with the admirers of the Patriarchs and their institutions. The so-called Protestant Methodists, repudiating even quasi-Episcopacy of their more lordly brethren, stand in bad odor at the South, as they cannot quite forget that their own founder, who was never a bishop, used to call slavery the sum of all villanies. The Baptist flourish south of the Mason-Dixon line in proportion as they sink Roger William's principles of liberty

[49] *The Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln*, (Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead, 1865), pp. 13-18.

> and encourage the growth of a hard shell over them. . . . . Congregationalists do not flourish in the thick atmosphere of slavery, and least of all those most consistent and thorough-going Congregationalists who encourage all freedom of thought and consequently all other legitimate freedom, protesting against popish subserviency to human masters in any shape.[50]

The editor therefore implied that the more rigid and ecclesiastical the polity of a denomination the greater the support of the *status quo* of the social order and the political and social evils of slavery; while the more democratic the organization of a church, the greater its demand for a change in the established order and the greater the opposition to slavery and other social ills. The writer did not include his own denomination, the Unitarian, in this survey.

After the outbreak of the Civil War in April 1861, two editorials appeared in the same journal in June and August of that year, stressing the conflict of Northern and Southern Christian theological and Biblical interpretation. "A Religious War" was the suggestive caption of the editorial.

> "It is a war of religions." The South is very fond of the idea that it is blessed with the purest and most unadulterated Orthodoxy, while the North is heretical and fatally philanthropic. . . . . They find slavery in the Bible, and they hold slaves, and therefore they imagine themselves the most clearly identified champions of the Bible. Advocacy of slavery is defence of God's holy Word. Dying for the peculiar institution of the South is beatific martyrdom in the cause of Christ. Their "religious war" resolves itself into a war for the right to enslave human beings. . . . .[51]

The editor essayed to silence the claims of Bishop Leonidas Polk of the Episcopal Church of the South, who asserted that the Southern "cause has for its object nothing less than the preservation of the purity of religious truth," and was the "cause of Heaven." The Bishop felt that the United States Government was "under the prime inspiration of an infidel horde" and that the Northern army brought "with it the withering influence of the infidelity of New England and Germany combined."[52] The reply of the editor was: "This seems to us of

[50] XXXVI, No. 9, 34.
[51] *Ibid.*, XL, No. 25, 98.
[52] *Ibid.*, No. 33, 130.

the quiet North very much like raving. . . . . If Liberal Christianity had been the universal religion of the South, we should hardly have had this rebellion. Perhaps we should not have had so long its prime moving cause (slavery)."[53] The Southern Churches adhered to a literal and strict construction of the "Christian constitution," the Bible, while Northern Christianity, in the main, either avoided the interpretation of the slavery issue, or advocated a loose construction and interpretation of the Bible, or shared the literal views of the South.

In the autumn of 1861 the *Christian Inquirer* (Unitarian) of New York City discussed the theme: "Religion in the War" and took the position that in the best sense the Civil War was "a religious war." The war objectives of both North and South were compared which revealed the religious principles and ideals of both sections.

The South makes this war on the strength of passion; the North makes the war on the strength of principle. The South fights for a feeling; the North fights for an idea. The question at the South is empire; aggrandizement, slavery, local independence, state-rights; the question at the North is liberty, law, union, nationality, loyalty, republicanism . . . . a war for the "rights of human nature. . . . ."[54]

The Unitarian editor of the Boston sheet, the *Christian Register*, charged Southern religion with both the support of the institution of slavery, and the coercive effort in support of the same, the rebellion.

> This whole dreadful rebellion has had close relations with the religion of the South. It is made a matter of boasting that, after the press, the clergy have been its most potent stimulators. Slavery, its essence and life, is preached as a divine institution. No war has seen so many clergymen in the ranks armed to the teeth. . . . .[55]

That Southern religion was responsible for the lower level of civilization, for the unrepublican, class-dominated oligarchies, for the paucity of creative theological literature, and for the demoralization of the South, was the accusation of Rev. Everett Hale in the summer of 1862. This Boston Unitarian declared

[53] XXXVI, No. 9, 34.
[54] XVI, No. 8, 2.
[55] XLI, No. 15, 58.

> . . . . the demoralization of the Southern country, and its indifference to a higher civilization, to the religion it has pretended to embrace . . . . to the formulas of a creed-bound, dogmatic, sacrificial religion. . . . . Since this literature of this nation was born, now nearly a century, there has not been published by any Southern theologian a volume of theology, in any department, which has made the slightest ripple on the theological thought of the world. . . . . The religious system which under the forms of the Baptist Church, the Methodist, the Episcopal, and the Presbyterian, has been the only system current in these states, is powerless to lift them to a higher civilization. . . . . The Southern States, under such influences have never become republics. They have been, as they are, oligarchies governed by a class. . . . .[56]

That orthodox Southern Christianity was powerless to shake off the shackles of slavery from the body politic, was the conviction of the Rev. W. H. Fish (Unitarian) of Cortland, New York, in 1863.

> Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, and the like, as to their fundamental ideas . . . . are congenial with slavery; and they are to-day, therefore, at the South, sanctifying and sustaining "the peculiar institution," and the secession, treason, and rebellion generated by it . . . . popular orthodox theology is not, in its nature, civilizing and humanizing. . . . . The intellectual and moral atmosphere of Boston, and not of Charleston, is the atmosphere of our hope. . . . .[57]

Mr. Fish felt that a liberal not a conservative interpretation of Christianity was the hope of the South, a religious program that included a central objective of slavery-elimination.

In 1864 correspondence from Norfolk, Virginia, to the *Congregationalist* of Boston, specifically charged the Southern clergy with disloyalty, stating that "the pulpit here (South) more than at the North, is the educator of the people." The Southern people remained true to the United States until the "pulpit led the way to the dark gulf of disunion. The ministry of the South went mad on slavery, and prepared the people for what they believed to be a holy war. . . . ."[58]

At the close of the war, the editor of the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago portrayed the Southland as a

[56] *The Christian Register* (Boston), XLI, No. 34, 133.
[57] *Ibid.*, XLII, No. 38, 149.
[58] XVI, No. 12, 46.

land of spiritual darkness in dire need of a Gospel of Light. The South in 1865 was an area not so extended but fully as benighted as any portion of Afghan or Hindoostan, where a pure religion may be taught, and a new and purer civilization may be introduced.[59]

Southern Christianity was an apostate faith from the viewpoint of the Northern Clergy who discussed this theme. Infrequent are the accounts treating Southern religion and these largely from Unitarian pens, whose disdain of orthodox theology was well known. The apostasy was due to religious support of the Southern social order, system of labor, secession and war. This loyalty was based upon a literalistic interpretation of the Scriptures. The ministers of the South were deemed "fallen from grace" because of their enthusiastic devotion to the Southern cause.

NORTHERN CLERICAL APOLOGISTS

There were, however, several Northern clergymen who had a much higher opinion of the Southern way of life than did the majority of their clerical brethren, and who expressed their views in publications that gained a widespread hearing, with accompanying approval at the South and condemnation at the North.[60]

The Rev. Nehemiah Adams, a Bostonian Congregationalist, made a three months' tour of the South, covering in 1854 the communities of Richmond, Virginia, Columbia, South Carolina, Savannah, Georgia. His impressions of the Southern negro apparently contradict those of the orthodox abolitionist or anti-slavery northern clergymen. He wrote his observations in a pamphlet entitled, *A South-Side View of Slavery*. The negroes in Savannah impressed him as follows: "a better looking, happier, more courteous set of people I had never seen . . . . unconscious of any feeling of restraint . . . . they did not act like a driven, overborne people, stealing about with sulky looks, imbruted by abuse, crazed, stupidly melancholic. . . . ." The men were "respectable in their attire," the women of "good appearance," and the children "as bright, affectionate, and capable as other children." As to the conduct of the negroes especially at

[59]XII, No. 31, 2.

[60]R. L. Stanton, *The Church and the Rebellion* (New York: Derby & Miller, 1864), p. 207.

night, exclusive of petty misdemeanors, Mr. Adams found the city streets "quiet," with an "absence of mobs" and that the negroes were not "predisposed to violence and insubordination," and that in "a well regulated southern household . . . . the rod is out of sight. . . . ." and that "if the colored people of Savannah, Columbia, and Richmond are not, as a whole, a happy people, I have never seen any. . . . ."[61]

Treating the advantages of slavery, Mr. Adams noted that "a strong public sentiment protects the person of the slave against annoyances and injuries. Boys and men cannot abuse another man's servant. Wrongs to his person are avenged. . . ." and that pauperism was prevented by slavery in that "every slave has an inalienable claim in law upon his master for support for the whole of life. He can not be thrust into an almshouse, he can not become a vagrant, he can not beg his living, he can not be wholly neglected when old and decrepit. . . . ." Treating religion, he discovered there was probably "in many places at the South a larger proportion of the slaves than the whites have given evidence of being the children of God. . . . ." and that there "is far more faith in the South, taken as a whole, than with us."[62]

Admitting the disadvantages, Mr. Adams sought to reveal the extenuating circumstances. While calling the slave auction a "revolting feature" he goes on to say:

> . . . . the sale of a negro . . . . is not a reckless, unfeeling thing in the towns at the south, where the subjects of the sale are from among themselves. . . . . In settling estates, good men exercise as much care with regard to the disposition of the slaves as though they were providing homes for white orphan children. . . . . Slaves are allowed to find masters and mistresses who will buy them. . . . .

Negro traders are "the abhorrence of all flesh" and cruel slave-owners "are . . . . much detested and avoided at the South. . . . ." He furthermore observed that there is an "injurious effect on slave labor upon the soil," that "labor performed by menial persons becomes disreputable in eyes of children (of whites)," that "slaves invent little or nothing . . . ." that "slave

[61] Nehemiah Adams, *A South-Side View of Slavery* (Boston: T. R. Marvin, 1855), pp. 18, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 24, 44, 43, 94, 62.

[62] *Ibid.*, pp. 38, 47, 53, 46.

labor is in many cases oppressively expensive. . . . . It takes more hands to do the same amount of work than with us. . . . ." and that "servants are hearty, and great consumers, frequently costing more for their food than the rest of the family. . . . ." He concluded that: "to be a slave at the South is an evil or not according to the character and habits of the master. . . . . Religion in the master destroys every thing in slavery which makes it obnoxious, and not only so, it converts the relation of the slave into an effectual means of happiness. . . . ." Mr. Adams explained the purpose of his book: that "it does not defend slavery. It aims to show what religion has done to mitigate its curse, and how we can in the most effectual way help to remove it. . . . ." His other incidental aim was "to defend humane and Christian slaveholders from the many aspersions cast upon them. . . . ."[63]

The Rev. Samuel Seabury (Episcopalian) of New York City in 1861 wrote a theoretical apologetic for Southern slavery as a means of restoring the good will and harmony between sections. His treatise was titled: *American Slavery Distinguished from the Slavery of English Theorists and Justified by the Law of Nature.* Heartily condemning abolitionists and anti-slavery workers in general, he desired two fixed principles of action: (1) The toleration of domestic slavery on grounds of both justice and expediency and (2) The resolute prohibition and, as far as possible, the annihilation of the slave-trade."[64] He did not treat philosophically the Southern Way of Life.

Bishop John Henry Hopkins, the Episcopal prelate of Vermont, startled the world of American Christendom by publishing a pamphlet, re-published later with a series of letters addressed to his critic, the Right Reverend Alonzo Potter, Episcopal Bishop of the Diocese of Philadelphia, under the long title, *A Scriptural, Ecclesiastical, and Historical View of Slavery from the Days of the Patriarch Abraham to the 19th Century.* The dates of publication and reprinting are 1861 and 1864. His views re-color the standard beliefs concerning the Southern Slavocracy as held by Northern clerical leaders. Taking his general stand upon the blessing of slavery, he said:

[63]Nehemiah Adams, *A South-Side View of Slavery* (Boston: T. R. Marvin, 1855), pp. 72, 73, 78, 132, 89, 90, 217; *The Quincy (Ill.) Whig Republican*, May 4, 1865, reported: "The Rev. Dr. Adams and Wendell Phillips, esq., both delivered good Union, North-side addresses the other day. Their conversions are remarkable."

[64]Samuel Seabury, *American Slavery* (New York: Mason Brothers, 1861), pp. 250, 312.

> and yet to the Guinea negro, sunk in heathen barbarism, it would be a happy change to place him in the hands of a Southern master . . . . that very slavery, in my humble judgment, has raised the negro incomparably higher in the scale of humanity; and seems, in fact, to be the only instrumentality through which the heathen posterity of Ham have been raised at all. . . . . I believe that the number of negroes Christianized and civilized at the South, through the system of slavery, exceeds the product of those missionary labors (U. S. and English African missions), in a proportion of thousands to one. . . . .

Discussing the religious aspects involving slavery, he wrote:

> In the Providence of God, the negro slavery of the South has been the means of saving millions of those poor creatures from the horrible state in which they must otherwise have lived and died. It has raised them on the scale of humanity, and brought them toward civilization under the light of religious truth . . . . slavery in the hands of the Southern masters has been a blessing . . . . to redeem them from a far more bitter bondage in Africa . . . . to train them up to the civilization of the Gospel, to qualify a portion of them to plant the State of Liberia, and to enroll five hundred thousand communicants amongst the professed Christians of the South. . . . .[65]

Then covering the usual topic of concern, the treatment of the slave by the master, Bishop Hopkins wrote:

> to prove the general fact, to which there are a few exceptions, namely, that the southern slaveholders are just and kind to their slaves, and that the negro race, under their care, are far better provided for, both temporarily and spiritually, than the laboring classes in England, or the free negroes among ourselves . . . . the general treatment which the slaves receive is such as would become a Christian people . . . . that the cases of severe or inhuman usages were rare and exceptional, and that, as a general rule, the negroes were really what the Southern people esteemed them—the happiest laborers in the world . . . . the masters of our Southern slaves are not heathen, but as good Christians, in general, as their defamers . . . . the relation of the master to the slave in the Southern States, involves no sin, provided the treatment of the slave be in accordance with the Scriptures. . . . .[66]

[65] John Henry Hopkins, *View of Slavery* (New York: W. I. Pooley, 1864), pp. 34, 39, 40, 69 350,

[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 326, 327, 330, 80, 349.

Mr. Hopkins stressed the economic privilege of the slave: "he receives a larger compensation, on the whole, than any of us would choose to pay in the support of himself from his birth to his burial, and the support besides of his wife and children, in sickness and in health, in childhood and old age, without any danger of the poorhouse, or of begging, or of starvation. . . . ." This Bishop of Philadelphia background and of Vermont diocese was one of the most roundly denounced church leaders in the North, both within and without his own communion. But when we understand the purpose of his tract, we find that he is really not pro-slavery for he says himself:

> I desire to see the Southern institution abolished as soon as it can be, peaceably, lawfully, and with a just regard to the best interests of all concerned. . . . . I have never been in favor of the perpetual bondage of the negro race, and never opposed their peaceable and gradual enfranchisement. . . . .[67]

Here were three moderates, or those who wished the issues settled peacefully; not fire eaters, who supported the Southern way of life one hundred per cent. But the way of the moderate is hard in the days of secession and war.

In general the Northern Clergy, who treated the theme of Southern Philosophy or the Southern Way of Life, believed that it was based upon a civilization of despotism, a social order of caste, a barbarous slavocracy, widespread immorality, and a static religion.

Southern philosophy was believed to be a menace because it endangered both the North and the South. In the North, it tended to undermine the ideals of democracy and equality expressed through free speech, free thought, free pulpit, free press, free schools, and free labor. In the South, it tended to disintegrate the personality, the character, and the morals of all classes of whites and blacks.

Southern civilization with its political oligarchy, its social aristocracy, its class legislation, its limited educational opportunities, and its spirit of superiority, coercion, and intolerance confronted Northern civilization with its political democracy, its social equality, its universal justice, its unlimited educational

[67]John Henry Hopkins, *View of Slavery* (New York: W. I. Pooley, 1864)., pp. 332, 349.

advantages, and its spirit of co-operation, teamwork, and tolerance.

These in essence were the beliefs, convictions, and opinions of those of the Northern clergy of such denominations as: Baptist, Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Protestant Episcopal, Unitarian, Universalist and Friend (Quaker), who have given these matters some consideration and have had their views published. Even the small minority which felt that there were redeeming values in the Southland, preferred its peaceful dissolution. It is upon such a concept or pattern or frame of reference as this that the Northern Clergy of the United States formulated their attitudes toward the South, primarily during the years of 1860-1865.

CHAPTER IV

The Clergy and the Holy Crusade of the Southland

THE emergence of a state of armed conflict between the North and the South divided the Northern clergy into quite varied camps of opinion; from that of respectful pacifism to that of blood-thirsty animosity; from that of studied silence to that of respectable loyalty; and from that of implicit neutrality to that of explicit nationalism. The vast number of ministers, however, speedily allied themselves with the forces and factors of patriotism. What were the clerical concepts of war and how did the clergy reconcile these militant beliefs with the Christian Gospel? In other words, what is a "Christian" war and when is a war "Christian"? Did the clergy have a share in the coming of and duration of the war? Were the clergy of the North a cause of the Civil War?

Christianity and War

A sermon discussion of the Christian philosophy of war filled four and one half columns of the *Salem (Mass.) Gazette*, in the issue of April 16, 1861. It had first been preached in the pulpit of First Church of Beverly, Massachusetts, by the Rev. Mr. Kimball. While the preacher did not believe that the present strife was either wise or expedient, he sought to blend the Old Testament concepts of battles with the New Testament ideals of peace.

> We remember that our Heavenly Father is a God of battles as well as a God of Peace. There are some evils in this world which are able to be put down only by the strong arm of force . . . . it is better at all times to endure even the horrors and sufferings of the battlefields rather than to be made the partakers of sin, and exposed to the corrupting influence of wrong. . . . .[1]

[1](Vol. not given), No. 31, p. 1.

War was considered a means of achieving the ideals of righteousness, and of destroying the influences of unrighteousness, rather than a great evil or the sum of evils in itself.

The Rev. T. B. Turner of the Warren Street Universalist Church of Boston believed that war was a temporary evil to overcome greater evils, and thus accomplish much good. These greater evils were the forfeiture of manliness; indifference in the conflict of right and wrong, of truth and falsehood, and of freedom and slavery; and treason to Government, Liberty, Civilization, and Humanity. Without war, many of these evils would wreck the nation, and with war, many would be destroyed.[2]

War was a method of doing God's Will to protect His Government (the Federal Union) from annihilation, was the view expressed by a correspondent to the *Congregationalist* of Boston. Instead of being an evil, war becomes a divine method of making regnant the Will of God. Said the writer: "This government is God's institution . . . . God will not . . . . deal lightly with its enemies . . . . mark the heroes of the hour . . . . to do the will of God. . . . ."[3] The soldier, then, is commissioned by God to protect Government.

The duty of the soldier was made synonymous with the duty of the Christian, by the Rev. A. L. Stone in his message before the Park Street Congregational Church of Boston shortly after the inception of hostilities. The soldier killed enemies in love.[4] Mr. Stone's homiletic effort was reported not only in his national denominational organ, the *Congregationalist,* but also received publicity in the *Journal* of Boston and early in May was republished in the *Quincy (Ill.) Whig Republican,* quoting the *Journal's* account. This is an example of the widespread publicity accorded war religious news.

The God of battles was invoked to justify war on the ground of preventing anarchy and of preserving the Union and American nationality. These were the sentiments conveyed in a letter

[2] *The Trumpet and Universalist Magazine* (Boston), XXXIII, No. 49, 193.

[3] XIII, No. 62, 2.

[4] *Ibid.* "If war is a duty, it is a Christian duty, as sacred as prayer—as solemn as sacraments. I have read of a Minister of the Gospel, who went into battle, and despatched one after another score of unerring bullets; and as each took effect, he apostrophized from afar the victim, 'My poor fellow, God have mercy on your soul.' That is the way to fight and in which to wait. . . . . It is mercy to go strong and strike hard . . . . Hang traitors. Above the terror of sword and bayonet, let there be a terror of the gibbet and the rope . . . . . Let the country burn this ulcer out . . . . . This is the message of the Law of Love."

to the *Congregationalist* from the Rev. R. B. Thurston of Waltham, Massachusetts. Mr. Thurston asserted: "A civil and servile war, with all their horrors are infinitely preferable to anarchy; no sacrifices are too great for the preservation of our nationality. . . . . We shall not fear . . . . to make our appeal to the God of battles. . . . ."[5]

April 1861 had not passed before the war had become a sacred and holy cause in the minds and souls of many Northern clergymen. Bishop T. M. Clark of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Rhode Island well expressed this ideal at the farewell service for the First Regiment of Rhode Island Detached Militia, just previous to their departure for Washington, April 20, 1861. "Soldiers of Rhode Island. Your country has called for your service and you are ready. . . . . It is a holy and righteous cause in which you are enlisted . . . . God is with us; . . . . the Lord of Hosts is on our side. . . . ."[6]

The Bishop concluded his remarks with a prayer of safety and protection. In the Bishop's words: "we invoke thy protection in behalf of thy servants who are now going forth to aid in saving our land from the ravages of sedition, conspiracy and rebellion. . . . ."[7]

War was also a defence of the home as well as the nation, according to the Rev. J. G. Bartholomew of the Universalist Church of Roxbury, Massachusetts. Honor and religion were also involved in the strife, which demanded the taking of sides.[8]

Perhaps the most wide-spread clerical apologetic for war was the idea of a God-approved defence of the Constitution and opposition to slavery extension. Thus did the *New York World* record the war-opinions of prominent Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist clergymen of the metropolis from their sermons of April 22nd. The Rev. J. B. Hagancy of St. Paul's Methodist

[5](Boston), XIII, No. 65, 1.

[6]*Newport Mercury* (Rhode Island), CIII, No. 5351, 2.

[7]*Ibid.*

[8]*The Hour of Peril* (Boston: Abel Tompkins, 1861), pp. 5-19. "God is speaking to you and me by every event of the hour. We must take sides in the contest; and he who, in this time of peril is a traitor to his country's freedom, is a traitor to the God of our fathers. I hate war in all its forms . . . . . But when a people stand in defence of their country and their homes—who after patient endurance of insult and injury, despotism takes up the weapons of war, and strikes a blow at our freedom, defence is the only alternative. . . . . In an hour like this there is nothing left but force . . . . . It is a struggle which involves our honor and our religion. . . . . when we heard the rattling shot on Sumter's granite breast, our blood was stirred, and our patriotism rose up in defence. . . . . "

Episcopal Church declared: "I, for one, am satisfied that we are right. A more righteous cause never awakened the martial spirit of a people. We appeal to arms in defense of that fundamental law . . . . a Constitution . . . . against the propagation of human slavery. . . . ."[9] Dr. Williams of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church stated: "If there be a cause which it might be presumed that God would bless, it is this—our constitutional government. . . . ."[10] Then Dr. Hague of the Madison Avenue Baptist Church valiantly took his stand: "Thanks to God my love of country is enhanced, and intensified by my belief that the ideas she represents are dear to the heart of the sovereign of the world, and that he will employ her as the chosen instrumentality to extend the bounds of his blessed dominion. . . . ."[11]

Christianity and war were happily wed in an editorial entitled: "Christ and the Sword" which appeared April 27th, in the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston. War was the cause of Christ to achieve peace.[12] A week later another editorial glorified the war as sacred, civilized, constructive—a matter of principle.[13] Rector F. C. Ewer of St. Anne's Protestant Episcopal Church of New York City agreed with this editor when he said: "Let us remember that this is a war of principle, not of vengeance. . . . ."[14]

The Christian case for war occupied the attention of the Northern clergy also in May and in some measure through 1861 and the entire war period, ever stimulated by major battle crises.

"May God defend the right now and forever," was the sermonic keynote sounded by Rector W. R. Pickman of St. Peter's Protestant Episcopal Church of Salem, Massachusetts, early in May. War was God's defence of the right, the God of Battles blessing the just cause, and deciding the issue.[15]

The war stand of the *Presbyterian* (Old School) of Philadelphia and the *Evangelist* (New School) of New York City, reveal

[9] I, No. 266, 8.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] XL, No. 17, 66. "Peace is to be through the sword.....the Saviour.....came not to send peace on earth, but a sword. It is a righteous cause that draws our swords, and therefore it is the cause of Christ....."

[13] *Ibid.*, No. 18, p. 69.

[14] *The National Crisis* (New York: Geo. F. Nesbitt, 1861), p. 15.

[15] *Salem Gazette* (Mass.), (Vol. not given), No. 36, 1.

the conservative and liberal attitudes of those communions. The editor of the former journal felt that war was an unavoidable necessity, to be terminated speedily and honorably.[16] The editor of the latter was assured that war was a lesser evil than anarchy and demoralization of the people. The support of the Government was imperative.[17]

The western clergy through pulpit and secular and sacred press reflected eastern attitudes as well as created their own. The *Christian Press* of Cincinnati in May quoted the *Pilgrim Herald* of Hartford, Connecticut, invoking the blessing of Heaven upon the war waged in a sacred cause.[18] The *Presbyter* of Cincinnati commended the shedding of blood at an expenditure of four fold to enforce law, preserving the Constitution and Union, and saving greater slaughter in the future.[19] With the leadership of God in a righteous cause, the Rev. S. W. Lynd, of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Mt. Auburn, Ohio, declared in his patriotic sermon before the home guards of his town: "Our beloved Union is the offspring of special providence. God guided our fathers to this land of promise. . . . .Let your reliance be upon the God of Battles."[20] The Rev. P. Coombe of the Ebenezer Methodist Episcopal Church of Cincinnati was convinced that the war was necessary to punish guilt that the law of God might not be broken. God's representative must not bear the sword in vain. Mr. Coombe averred: "The guilt must be punished or divine law is willingly violated." There can be no compromise with treason.[21]

Testimonial after testimonial might be given which placed Christianity and war upon the whole-hearted basis of unity, harmony, and co-operation. In word and in deed, the pulpit preacher, the army chaplain and the religious editor united the ideals of patriotism and religion, of state and church, and of humanity and divinity and deity. Bishop Matthew Simpson of the Methodist Episcopal Church asserted dramatically: "We will take the glorious flag—the flag of our country—and nail it just below that of the cross! . . . . Around it let us gather,

[16]XXXI, No. 17, 66.
[17]Quoted by *The Presbyterian Herald* (Louisville), XXX, No. 44, 1.
[18]X, No. 9, 374.
[19]Quoted by *The Presbyterian Herald* (Louisville), XXX, No. 44, 1.
[20]*Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXVIII, No. 22, 3.
[21]*Ibid.*, No. 30, 2.

'First Christ's, then our country's.' "[22] Dr. Henry Ward Beecher in June 1861 told his congregation: "I am going to fight this battle straight through . . . . and not lose my Christian feelings . . . . I am going to stick close to my Savior."[23] The editorial in the *American Presbyterian* (Philadelphia) entitled, "The Cross and the Flag," entwined these two outstanding American symbols.

> Our Church puts the Cross and the Flag close together. Next to our duty to God, comes our great social duty to our country. . . . . We would cheerfully die for the Saviour's cause, the next object for which we would offer our life is our country. . . . .[24]

Two symbolic ceremonies vividly portrayed the intimate relationship of Northern Christianity and the Civil War: the formal presentation of a sword to a chaplain by his brother ministers; and the stated baptism of a cannon at a fort by a chaplain, both exemplified in June. The Rev. Mr. Jameson, chaplain of the Rhode Island Regiment who accepted the sword, said that some might consider such a gift from ministers rather strange, but that "religion made men loyal to the state, and prepared them to receive a call to arms . . . . as they would a voice from Heaven."[25] The Rev. Father Mooney, chaplain of the New York 69th was highly pleased to officiate at the honorable ceremony of "the christening of the noble gun on Fort Corcoran."[26] The Cross and the Flag, the sword and the cannon, the God of Battles, and the Prince of Peace!

Both the secular and religious press gave full publicity to the varied religious attitudes and activities of the Northern Clergy; first the report of a sermon before the stated congregation, then an account of a special service for departing volunteers; an editorial treating some phase of religion and war, the story of a chaplain's address at the front, and at times clerical criticism of the super-patriotism of religious leaders. In November 1861 Chaplain A. H. Conant addressed the 19th Illinois Volunteers in the Baptist Church at Elizabethtown, Kentucky, speaking on the conduct of the war and the spirit in which

[22] *Springfield Republican* (Mass.), XXXVIII, No. 21, 1.
[23] *Ibid.*, No. 22, 1.
[24] Quoted by the *Advocate* (Buffalo), XII, No. 598, 1.
[25] *Newport Mercury* (Rhode Island), CIV, No. 5359, 2.
[26] *Springfield Republican* (Mass.), XXXVIII, No. 25, 1.

soldiers should wage the conflict. Their spirit was to be that of the peacemaker, loving their enemies, blessing and doing good to their opponents.[27] *Our War, and Our Religion and Their Harmony* set forth most learnedly the Christian apologetic for war. This sermon delivered by the Rev. William Barrows at Old South Congregational Church of Reading, Massachusetts, early in 1862, described the work of deity in the world and the duties of mankind to assist God in militant service.[28] In the second year of the war the Right Reverend Gregory T. Bedell, Episcopal Bishop Coadjutor of Ohio spoke of the intimate relations of religion and the state when he said: "In a war for national existence, between loyalty and rebellion, Christianity should be a synonym for patriotism. Loyalty to Christ is loyalty to that civil authority which Christ . . . . has established for us. . . . . "[29] In plain parlance, in times of national emergency, Christian loyalty must coincide with political and civic loyalty.

In the autumn of 1862 a defense of the North appeared in the *Edinburgh Scotsman,* by the Rev. Theodore Cuyler (Presbyterian) of Brooklyn, the gist of his article being: "All Christendom has a mighty stake in this war."[30]

On the occasion of the departure of a volunteer company for the front, a farewell service was held Sunday afternoon, October 5, 1862, in the Congregational Church of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire. The Rev. William L. Gaylord spoke on the opportune topic, *The Soldier God's Minister.* His text was one of the most popular of war-time verses, Romans 13:4, "He beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God." He counseled the officers and men to defend religion, native land, and God, avoiding all spirit of hate and vindictiveness.[31]

The holy alliance of Jehovah and Mars in a blending of

[27] *Christian Inquirer* (New York), XVI, No. 10, 2.

[28] (Boston: J. M. Whittemore, 1862), pp. 6, 12, 18. "So God is just as glorious when he takes vengeance as when he shows mercy, when he burns Sodom as when he builds Jerusalem. . . . . Sinai reflects his excellency as much as Calvary. . . . . one of his glories is to visit judgment where there is merit of it, and a necessity for it... It is right to pray that our armies may overthrow the enemies of the Republic. It is right to rejoice over the victories, when we gain them. . . . . We bear the sword under the appointment of God, and we must not bear it in vain. . . . . "

[29] G. F. Smythe, *A History of the Diocese of Ohio Until the Year* 1918 (Cleveland: Published by the Diocese; Horace Carr, 1931), p. 314.

[30] *Christian Secretary* (Hartford), XLI, No. 2011, 1.

[31] (Fitchburg: Rollstone Job Printing, 1862), pp. 17-19. "Strike for your altars. Strike for your sacred sanctuaries. Strike to defend your Christian faith. . . . . Strike for God and your native land. . . . . We must be careful, in this strife, to guard our hearts against the spirit of vindictiveness and hate. . . . . The time to preach or pray to the South is ended. Nay. There is a gospel which we are bound to preach most faithfully to them. It is 'writ in rows of burnished steel.' "

divine and military symbolism, was admirably set forth in the *Methodist* magazine in 1864. The writer said imperatively:

> We must take the morals, the sacred, the holy right of our struggle up before the throne of God. We must accustom ourselves to dwell before the divine throne, clothed in the smoke of our battles . . . . we have a right to plead and to expect that God will let his angels encamp about our army; that he will make our cause his own—nay, it is his already. . . . ."[33]

While many Northern ministers thus supported the God of Battles with a military fervor, there were some who resented this spirit as being unChristian, and preferred to sustain the God of discipline in the spirit of good will. Still others would not support any form of war and supplanted the God of force with the God of love. The Rev. G. W. Quinby (Universalist) of Middletown, Connecticut, represented the former groups of ministers. He was certain that ministers who lead in the fighting spirit of hatred and revenge could not be Christian, and would cause the Christian Church to lose its power. He asked and answered his pertinent query: "Can I engage in war, and still be a Christian? I answer yes."[33] Mr. Quinby would discipline the South in the spirit of kindness and good will. There were other ministers who were assured that the whole war system and method were unChristian, and who had maintained their pacifist position from colonial days, such examples being the Friends (Quakers), the Mennonites, and similar smaller bodies. Several examples will reveal their position. The editor of the *Friend* (Philadelphia) in March 1862, in the midst of the war-torn land, urged his co-religionists to maintain their peaceable principles in speech and deed to radiate the spirit of good will and conciliation.[34] In 1864 the editor of the same paper succinctly stated the Quaker position as follows:

> . . . . the man who believes in his heart that his Maker requires him to abstain from war and bloodshed, and contention and fighting, as contrary to his pure and loving nature, would be doing a real disservice to his country by giving countenance to any of them, because he would be

[33] Quoted by the *Trumpet and Christian Freeman* (Boston), XLVI, No. 8, 1.

[33] *The Trumpet and Christian Freeman* (Boston), XXXIV, No. 6, 22.

[34] XXXV, No. 30, 239.

> sinning against heaven and his own soul, and thus invoking Divine displeasure and judgment.[35]

In another Quaker periodical, the *Friends Review,* an editorial entitled "The Spirit of War" set forth the absolute incompatibility of war and Christianity, and declared that all attempts to harmonize and reconcile the two must be in vain.[36] Editor John F. Funk of the Mennonite paper, the *Herald of Truth,* summarized the stand of that religious body in his article on "The Draft." He wrote: "We as followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, believing that the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, cannot engage in this work of blood and death, for conscience sake."[37] In the main, most Northern ministers supported the war.

THE WAR POSITION OF DENOMINATIONAL GROUPS

(In most cases determined by lay as well as clerical delegates.)

Baptist

The Baptist Assembly (Northern States), Brooklyn, May 29, 1861.

> . . . . the doctrine of secession is foreign to our Constitution, revolutionary, suicidal . . . . the National Government deserves loyal adhesion and unstinted support . . . . the Gospel of Christ, then, sanctions true patriotism. . . . .[38]

The West New Jersey Baptist Association, Mount Holly, September 13, 1861.

> . . . . it is our duty as citizens, as Baptists, and as Christians, to resist such traitors, North and South, by speech, with the pen, and with the press; and, if need be, with the implements of death on the field of battle, pledging to the Government and the Constitution, as our fathers did, 'Our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. . . . .'[39]

The Philadelphia Baptist Association, 1862.

> . . . . we reaffirm our unswerving loyalty to the Government of the United States . . . . we protest any compromise with rebellion. . . . .[40]

[35] XXXVIII, No. 1, 7.
[36] XVI, No. 15, 232.
[37] I, No. 8, 50.
[38] Edward McPherson, *The Political History of the United States of America during the Great Rebellion* (Washington: Solomons & Chapman, 1876), pp. 474-75.
[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 475-76.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 476.

The Illinois General Baptist Association, October 21, 1861.

> . . . . we believe it to be the design of Providence that Slavery having taken the sword, shall perish by the sword. . . . .[41]

The California Baptist Associations, 1861.

> . . . . it is our duty as citizens and Christians to aid the Government in every possible way, to maintain its authority unimpaired over all the States and Territories now in open rebellion against the laws.[42]

Congregational

The Congregational Conference of Maine, June 21, 1864.

> . . . . we re-affirm our confidence in the general policy of the National Administration, and more than ever feel it our duty to give the government a cordial and earnest support in thoroughly suppressing the rebellion, and restoring the Union on the basis of liberty. . . . .[43]

The Congregational Conference of Massachusetts, September 14, 1864.

> . . . . we watch the progress of the arms of the Union in putting down the most criminal rebellion the world ever saw . . . . we believe God is on our side, and will give us in due time full and crowning success . . . . it is the duty of Christian ministers to set forth by some appropriate teaching the importance of the great principles at hazard in the impending and progressive political struggle. . . .[44]

General Association of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, 1864.

> . . . . our hopes for the preservation of our liberties as a nation, and for the complete emancipation of the African race in the South, depend, under God, upon sustaining the Government in upholding the integrity of the Union, through all the trials and doubts and disasters of the war . . . . we solemnly pledge ourselves before God . . . . to sustain the Government in subjugating the rebellion. . . . .[45]

Free Methodist

New York Conference, 1864.

> . . . . as much as we deprecate the suffering caused by

[41] *The Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* (Chicago), IX, No. 11, 2.
[42] *The Advocate* (Buffalo), XII, No. 618, 2.
[43] McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 481.
[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 480-81.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 480.

the civil war . . . . we have no desire to have it stop until the rebellion is thoroughly subdued, and Slavery, its guilty cause, is completely and forever extinguished in all our borders . . . . we do most cordially sustain the Government in its efforts to subdue the rebellion. . . . .[46]

Friend or Quaker

Yearly Meeting for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Eastern Shore of Maryland, 1862.

We earnestly desire that the Chief Magistrate of the Nation and our Congress may, in this season of deep trial, humbly seek Divine guidance, that under this influence they may act for the cause of justice and mercy, in that wisdom which is pure, peaceable and profitable to direct, and that the effusion of blood may be stayed.[47]

Yearly Meeting, 1864.

We respect, honor and love this Government . . . . we desire that it may, in no particular, be found striving against God, or persecuting his children. . . . . Under the present law of Congress, every able-bodied citizen with certain ages, in time of war, is liable to be called upon by the Government to bear arms in its defence. We represent a people who cannot comply with this law without disobeying the command of God to them. Neither can they furnish a substitute or pay any equivalent or fine imposed for exemption from military service, because in so doing, they feel that they would implicate themselves in a violation of their conscientious scruples in this respect. . . . . For more than two hundred years our Society has held the doctrine, that all wars and fightings were forbidden to them, as followers to them. . . . . We their descendants . . . . not alone with a view to shield ourselves from suffering, but under a sense of duty to God, to assert the sacred rights of conscience, to raise the standard of the Prince of Peace before the nation. . . . . In this defining of our position, we enter not into judgment or condemnation of those upon whom rests the responsibility of guiding the nation through the awful perils of civil war. . . . .[48]

German Reformed

Pennsylvania German Reformed Synod, 1863.

. . . . the powers that be are ordained of God, and that it

[46] McPherson, *op. cit.*, pp. 500-501.
[47] *Ibid.*, p. 503.
[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 503-504.

is the solemn duty of all Christians, enjoying the protection of such civil rulers, to pray for them, and we should feel especially obligated to do so during a time of peril like that through which our beloved country is now passing.[49]

Pennsylvania German Reformed Synod, 1864.

. . . . To give expression to the unfaltering devotion with which the German Reformed Church in the United States has hitherto sustained the cause of our common country, and we earnestly urge upon our clergy and laity to continue to labor and pray for the success of the Government, in its efforts to suppress the existing rebellion, and to restore peace and union. . . . .[50]

Lutheran

General Synod, 1862.

. . . . the rebellion against the constitutional Government of this land is most wicked in its inception, unjustifiable in its cause, unnatural in its character, inhuman in its prosecution, oppressive in its aims, and destructive in its results to the highest interests of morality and religion . . . . in the suppression of this rebellion and in the maintenance of the Constitution and the Union by the sword, we recognize an unavoidable necessity and a sacred duty, which the Government owes to the nation and to the world . . . . we call upon all our people to lift up holy hands in prayer to the God of battles. . . . .[51]

General Synod of 1864.

. . . . we acknowledge with profound gratitude to Almighty God, the various and important success which have thus far crowned our arms; the merciful interposition of Providence in delivering us from the invasions of the enemy, and in protecting our homes, our churches, and our institutions from the desolations of war. . . . .[52]

Methodist Protestant

General Convention, 1862.

. . . . we recommend that this war be pushed with its utmost energy and to the last extremity. . . . .[53]

[49]McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 482.
[50]*Ibid.*
[51]*Ibid.*, pp. 478-79.
[52]*Ibid.*, pp. 479-80.
[53]*Ibid.*, pp. 499-500.

Annual Conference Pittsburgh, 1864.

> This Conference does hereby declare its loyalty to the Government of the United States . . . . we hereby advise all our people to be faithful to the Administration in all its efforts to maintain the Union. . . . .[54]

Methodist Episcopal

Northwestern Indiana Conference, 1861.

> . . . . we look upon this rebellion as wicked in the highest degree . . . . we as ministers of the Gospel . . . . will not cease to exert an influence in sustaining our Government . . . . the Administration has our cordial sympathies and shall have our prayers. . . . .[55]

Central Ohio Conference, 1861.

> . . . . we heartily sanction the firm and decisive action of our Government . . . . to defend the country and to crush the rebellion . . . . we conscientiously believe in the rectitude of our cause, that it is approved by Heaven and the civilized world. . . . .[56]

General Conference, 1864.

> It is the duty of the government to prosecute the war with all its resources of men and money till this wicked rebellion be subdued, the integrity of the nation shall be secured, and its legitimate authority shall be re-established. . . . .[57]

Moravian

Synod of the Moravian Church, 1861.

> . . . . in acknowledging our constitutional government, and the liberty and blessings which we have been permitted to enjoy under it, as members of the Moravian church, deem it our duty to extend to it, our hearty support in its efforts and measures to uphold the constitution, to maintain the integrity of these United States, and to perpetuate to ourselves and our children the liberties and blessings of our republican institutions. . . . .[58]

Synod of the Moravian Church, 1864.

> . . . . an earnest support of the Constitution and Laws . . . . as well as an earnest support of the General and

[54] McPherson, *op. cit.*, pp. 499-500.
[55] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXVIII, No. 43, 1.
[56] *Ibid.*, XXVIII, No. 41, 2.
[57] McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 498.
[58] *Ibid.*, p. 483.

State Governments under them—a religious duty . . . . we, of this Synod, hereby express our willingness to render the constituted authorities of our land all the aid in our power to subdue unrighteous rebellion. . . . .[59]

Presbyterian (New School)

General Assembly, 1861.

. . . . it be recommended to all our pastors and churches to be instant and fervent in prayer for the President of the United States and all in authority under him. . . . .[60]

General Assembly, 1862.

. . . . to pledge the churches and Christian people under our care, as ready to join with us in the same fervent sympathies and united prayers, that our rulers in the Cabinet and our commanders in the field and on the waters, and the brave men under their leadership, may take courage under the assurance that 'The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America' are with them in heart and hand, in life and effort, in this fearful conflict. . . . .[61]

Presbyterian (Old School)

General Assembly, 1862.

This whole treason, rebellion, anarchy, fraud and violence, is utterly contrary to the dictates of natural religion and morality, and is plainly condemned by the will of God. It is the clear and solemn duty of the National Government to preserve, at whatever cost, the national Union and Constitution, to maintain the laws in their supremacy, to crush force by force, and to restore the reign of public order and peace to the entire nation. . . .[62]

General Assembly, 1864.

. . . . to procure eventually the final abolition of slavery in America.[63]

Protestant Episcopal

Diocese of Pennsylvania, 1864.

. . . . we hereby declare our unfaltering allegiance to the Government of the United States, and that we pledge it our willing devotion and service . . . . this rebellion may

[59] McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 483.
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 469.
[61] *Ibid.*
[62] *Ibid.*, pp. 462-63.
[63] *Ibid.*, p. 465.

be put down; that oppression and slavery in all its forms may be done away . . . . there shall be one Union, one Government, one Flag, one Constitution. . . . .[64]

Reformed Protestant Dutch

General Synod, 1863.

. . . . we tender to the Government of the United States, and those who represent it, the renewed expression of our warmest and deepest sympathy in its present protracted struggle to maintain its lawful authority and to preserve unbroken the integrity and union of these States . . . . we will yield a cordial support to all such measures, not incompatible with the great law of righteousness, as may be necessary to suppress the existing rebellion and assert the complete authority of the Union over all proper territory and domain. . . . .[65]

General Synod, 1864.

. . . . heartily sympathizes with the Government of the United States in its efforts to crush rebellion against its rightful, and to restore to this now distressed people their once cherished integrity as a union of states. . . . .[66]

Roman Catholic

Bishop James Wood of the Diocese of Philadelphia, 1864.

We cheerfully call your attention (to the Clergy and the Faithful) to the invitation of his Excellency, the President of the United States, who, in announcing the recent successes of the Union arms, desires that all should unite in thanksgiving, supplications and prayers to the Great Ruler of the destinies of nations. Let us, therefore, send up our thanksgivings to God for the merciful dispositions of His Divine Providence in our regard, and pour forth our earnest supplications that His Divine blessing may descend upon us, and procure for us the inestimable fruit of national harmony and fraternal union. . . . .[67]

Archbishop John B. Purcell of the Diocese of Cincinnati, 1864.

. . . . we should rally round the constituted authorities, the 'powers' which the Apostle commands us to obey, and thus presenting an undivided front to the enemy, re-establish the Union, without which there can be no

[64] McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 493.
[65] *Ibid.*, p. 482.
[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 482-83.
[67] *Ibid.*, p. 502.

panacea, present or prospective, for the ills they suffer. The South beholding us thus of one mind, will, we devoutly trust, hasten to make peace, and we, on our side, will show them that we are ready and willing to make greater sacrifices for peace and union with them than ever we made for war. . . . .[68]

Unitarian

Conference of the Western Unitarian Association, Toledo, 1863.

. . . . we give to the President of the United States, and to all who are charged with the guidance and defence of our nation in its present terrible struggle for the preservation of liberty, public order, and Christian civilization, against the powerful wickedness of treason and rebellion, the assurance of our cordial sympathy and steady support, and that we will cheerfully continue to share any and all needful burdens and sacrifices in the holy cause of our country. . . . .[69]

Convention, Springfield, Massachusetts, 1863.

. . . . we tender to the President of the United States our sympathy and our prayers in this great day of the country's peril and his responsibility . . . . while we owe allegiance to the constituted authorities at all times, we hold it now, when treason and rebellion are abroad, an especial duty, both by word and act, to express it. . . . .[70]

United Brethren in Christ

East Pennsylvania Conference, 1863.

Whereas our beloved and prosperous country, by the hellish intrigues of designing aspirants after power and gain, is now deluged by one of the most unholy and diabolical rebellions that ever cursed our world . . . . we believe God, in his divine providence has put Abraham Lincoln, the proper man in his right place, the Presidential chair, and that we endorse his every effort to rid the country of the most heaven daring of all evils and sins—human slavery.[71]

United Presbyterian

General Assembly, 1862.

. . . . we feel and hereby express our gratitude to God for the recent victories and advantages obtained over the

[68] McPherson, *op. cit.* p. 503.
[69] *Ibid.*, p. 504.
[70] *Ibid.*
[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 504-505.

enemy, and cherish the hope and belief that God will continue his favor until rebellion shall be forever crushed and peace restored.[73]

Universalist

General Convention, 1861.

> . . . . we hereby express our earnest sympathy with our rulers in this hour of trial; with our countrymen in arms for the defence of our institutions, and with the ministers of our own and other Christian orders who are called in the Providence of God, to administer Christian admonition and consolation in the camp and on the field . . . . as a denomination, pledge our earnest labors, our pecuniary means, and our heartfelt prayers for the success of the Federal arms, the defeat of this unnatural rebellion, and the return of an honorable peace. . . . .[73]

General Convention, 1863.

> . . . . we still appeal to our rulers and the people not to abate their vigor in prosecuting the war until the rebellion is effectually subdued . . . . we renew our expressions of Christian fidelity and loyalty to the Government, and reaffirm our confidence in our Chief Magistrate, whose honesty of purpose stands unimpeached. . . . .[74]

THE CAUSES OF THE WAR

1. The Clergy of the North and South

Professor R. L. Stanton of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Danville, Kentucky, a contemporary historian, in his work, *The Church and the Rebellion,* published in 1864, reported a widespread conviction that the Ministry of the Northern States was a decided influence in bringing on the war between the States.[75] He declared

> Politicians, secular and religious journals, pamphleteers, men in all classes of society, freely lay the blame of this Rebellion, in great measure, or wholly, at the door of the Church; charging the ministry, more especially, with having caused it. This is a very prevalent statement, if we may judge what has been said or written. . . . .[76]

Dr. Stanton felt that the Northern ministers who supported "Southern rights" had "a large portion of this responsibility to

[73]McPherson, *op. cit.*, 504-505.
[73]*Ibid.*, p. 505.
[74]*Ibid.*, p. 506.
[75](New York: Derby & Miller, 1864), Preface, p. vi.
[76]*Ibid.*

bear," and that "a large and influential class among clergymen and editors of the Church of all branches of the North, exerted such an influence for a long course of years, whether so intended or not, as to foster that spirit, and countenance those claims put forth by the South. . . . ."[77]

The border-state editor of the *Presbyterian Herald* of Louisville, Kentucky, was probably the most outspoken of religious journalists in charging his clerical brethren with being both direct and indirect causes of conflict. In November 1860 he wrote:

> The very worst omen of the times is the fact that the religious men of the country stand apart to so great an extent in this hour of trial. Most of the Churches have split on the very rock upon which the State is foundering. In fact their divisions have prepared the way and laid the foundation for the political divisions which now exist. . . . .[78]

Then at the close of 1861 this editor's worst fears had been realized, and he minced no words in placing the blame for the war upon the political preachers, the curse of both Church and State, in war-causation, war-duration, and reconstruction. He said: "The preachers of the country have had no small share in bringing the country to its present calamitous condition, and their influence will probably stand more largely in the way of future adjustment of our difficulties than any other cause."[79]

The writer apparently included the ministers of both North and South in his accusation, and forecast reconstruction hazards due to continuing sectional clerical hostility.

In January of 1861, some weeks before the outbreak of military hostilities, the Episcopal editor of the *Calendar* of Hartford, Connecticut, placed the responsibility for sectional divisiveness at the door of the Puritan (Congregational), the Presbyterian, and the Methodist Churches and leaders, and acknowledged Episcopal guilt for minor division. He blamed the political preaching of Northern ministers for embittering the South against the North, as the outstanding cause of sectional discord. While secession had been the order of the day for fifty years among the churches, the pioneers being the Presbyterians and

[77] McPherson, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-93.
[78] XXX. No. 21, 2.
[79] *Ibid.*, XXXI. No. 25, 2.

Methodists, the editor specifically charged the Puritan Clergy of New England with being the chief political preachers. He was gratified that the Episcopal Church was virtually free from such sermonizing and divisions.[80]

After the declaration of war, in April 1861, the Rev. Granville Moody (Methodist), speaking in the chapel of Brookville College, Franklin, Indiana, instead of denouncing the clergy as a cause of civil war, considered these charges a matter of glory. He said: "We are charged with having brought about the present contest. . . . . I believe it is true that we did bring it about, and I glory in it, for it is a wreath of glory around our brow."[81]

"Where, then, is the chief responsibility of our present national calamities?" queried Dr. P. Coombe of the Ebenezer Methodist Episcopal Church of Cincinnati. He placed the guilt at the door of the Churches of the land, chiefly the Methodist Church, and specifically the ultraists of that Church both North and South. He concluded with the significant statement: "The sundering of the Churches has prepared the way for the sundering of the States."[82]

The fiery editor of the *Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register* of New York City, in 1864 assailed the Puritans of the nation as war leaders.[83] A month later he broadened his attack to include virtually all Protestant groups, with the Roman Catholic Church officially free from such excesses. He wrote: "The Protestant pulpits have, with few exceptions, been turned into political rostrums. . . . ."[84]

Unique in Edward McPherson's contemporary war history was a word of comment from a branch of Southern Christendom implying that the churches and ministers of the North were one of the inciting causes of civil conflict. The report of the Rev. Dr. Fuller, unanimously adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention on May 13, 1861, at Savannah stated that "while the two sections of the land are thus arrayed against each other, it might

[80] XVII, No. 835, 13.

[81] *The Crisis* (Columbus, Ohio), I, No. 29, 1.

[82] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXVIII, No. 30, 1-2.

[83] XXV, No. 29, 4. "In this horrible war of American States, hatreds, of persons and populations towards each other, have mingled with the public cause. The attacking party, has largely been officered by men taught, by the Puritan pulpit, by Puritan newspapers, by Puritan lecturers, and in schools infected by Puritan books and teachers, to hate the people of the South. The attacked, had all the feelings incident to a people whose homes were invaded, and their property and lives imperilled. . . . . "

[84] *Ibid.*, No. 32, 4.

naturally have been hoped that at least the churches of the North would interpose and protest against this appeal to the sword . . . . but with astonishment and grief, we find churches and pastors of the North breathing out slaughter, and clamoring for sanguinary hostilities with a fierceness which we would have supposed impossible among the disciples of the Prince of Peace. . . . ."[85]

The clerical fire-eaters of both North and South had eclipsed the peace-loving and Union-loving clergy of both sections, and war apparently submerged the normal Christian spirit.

2. *Northern Abolition and Anti-Slavery Leaders* (Clerical and Lay)

The moderate anti-slavery and the radical abolition leaders, both clerical and lay, were charged with being a cause of national strife. Preaching on the theme: "The Character and Influence of Abolitionism," the Rev. Henry J. Van Dyke on December 9, 1860, declared in the First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, that the abolition principles have been promulgated chiefly by misrepresentation and abuse and that it is the "chief cause of the strife that agitates, and the danger that threatens, our country. . . . ."[86] In the summer of 1861 the *Christian Review* (Baptist) of Rochester, New York, added its word of trenchant testimony concerning the abolitionist movement. This malignant philanthropy has been unmeasured in its denunciation of the South and portions of the Northern Church have been unwise and unfraternal in their condemnation of Southern slavery.[87] But back of the swift method of abolition or the slower process of anti-slavery emancipation, stood the institution of slavery, which was discerned as the central cause of sectional grief. The Rev. T. B. Turner of the Warren Street Universalist Church of Boston preached a sermon on "The Conflict," which was published May 4, 1861, in his national denominational paper. He asserted that the national difficulty was slavery, the conflict "between the barbarism of Slavery and the Civilization of Liberty" not the election of a Republican president, or fear of unconstitutional aggressions by such a president

[85] *The Political History of the United States during the Great Rebellion* (3d ed.; Washington: Solomons & Chapman, 1876), p. 154.

[86] *The Crisis* (Columbus, Ohio), I, No. 6, 2.

[87] XXVI, Article 7, 508-509, (Ju-61).

in the South, or the formation of a Southern Confederacy or the bombardment of Fort Sumter.[88] Dr. Humphrey (Congregationalist) of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, charged the despotism of slavery "with having culminated in the present . . . . outbreak."[89] The editor of the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago held that slavery "was the very heart of this whole struggle."[90] The Methodist editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* also claimed that slavery was "at the bottom of all our troubles."[91] Slavery had its share in the tensions of the hour.

3. Demagogues, Politicians, and Public Sentiment

That demagogues were a cause of sectional strife and coming warfare was another charge. But whether they referred to politicians or professional reformers (including preachers) or both is not certain. The border-state editor of the *Presbyterian Herald* of Louisville made this charge in November 1860. He believed that the masses of the North and South were honest and patriotic but were led by sectional demagogues who fanned their feelings and prejudices to white heat, mutual misunderstanding, which threatened the Federal Government itself.[92] In May 1861 an article in the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago listed the Southern politician representatives and business men as rebellion leaders. The politicians had broken their allegiance to the Government, had conspired with others to seize Federal property in the South, while the business men had broken their contracts with their Northern creditors.[93] Shortly after the outbreak of hostilities, the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati placed the causal responsibility upon Southern politicians, exempting the deceived masses of the people. Believing that a seditious plot for the dismemberment of the Federal Union had been in existence for a number of years, the editor said that the few who govern the many, these conspiring politicians, were guilty of this work of destruction.[94] The ruling faction which controlled public sentiment was the war monger group in the coming of

[88] *The Trumpet and Universalist Magazine* (Boston), XXXIII, No. 49, 193.
[89] *The Congregationalist* (Boston), XIII, No. 65, 1.
[90] IX, No. 8, 2.
[91] XXVIII, No. 36, 4.
[92] XXX, No. 18, 2.
[93] VIII, No. 40, 3.
[94] XXVIII, No. 17, 2.

the war between the States. In January 1861 the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* said of the South:

> The prescriptive and prevailing sentiment has been, and still is, that the Federal Government is to be endured so long as it shall be administered to the pleasing of the people of that section . . . . the hitherto ruling faction appear to think that the time for resistance and secession has fully come . . . . the result of the late election is not the cause of their disaffection, but only the occasion of the accomplishment of a long contemplated purpose. . . . .[95]

Mob psychology suggestive of religious revivalism, was given as a cause of the Southern rebellion by the editor of the above journal in 1862. The movement was propagated not by argument, self-interest, patriotism, sectional pride, or fear of violence, but by "a kind of contagious frenzy . . . . a movement of insane and infectious irritation of the sensibilities; akin . . . . to the 'Kentucky jerks' of a not remote day."[96]

A keen distinction between two factors in Southern public opinion—the Southerner and the Southern nationalist—was made by Dr. Avery O. Craven in his *Edmund Ruffin—Southerner.* The Southerner shared the characteristics that were the product of two forces, an Old World country gentleman ideal and the presence of negroes. The former turned the talents of the South to farming and gave the landholder position and privilege. The country seating and the amusements and airs of a gentleman which went with it, even the reverence for women and the liking for military display, belonged to a people whose traditions were borrowed from abroad and who were struggling to reproduce an old order, not to build a new one. The presence of negroes as laborers checked the inflow of other workers from Europe, keeping the original stocks pure save as they mingled in rural simplicity to form a typically American human product.[97] The Southern nationalist was obsessed by the belief in being different from other Americans, and incited jealousy, hatred, and finally war, an emotion produced by an assumption on the part of outsiders of a unity there which did not exist, by propaganda within which emphasized likenesses rather than

[95] XXVIII, No. 3, 1.
[96] *Ibid.*, XXIX, No. 23, 178.
[97] (New York: D. Appleton, 1932), pp. 96-103.

differences, and created a unity of fear where none other existed. Two steps in the formation of the South which transformed sentiments into convictions, and differences into hostilities were the high protective tariff, endangering all rural-agricultural people and the demand of the abolitionist for the immediate destruction of slavery.[98]

Thus demagogues, politicians, and other manipulators of public sentiment were included in the accusations of war-guilt.

4. Providential Discipline and Punishment

The development of national character as well as the purging of national sin, provided a further expression of war causation. The clergyman invariably saw life through the spectacles of right and wrong, of good and bad, of righteousness and evil, with God at work in the plan of the ages to reward and punish, according to the life of the nation and the individual. In almost any era, the times are "out of joint" in the eyes of the clergy, and especially is this true in an era of crisis and conflict.

In the midst of secessions, hazards, and impending war, the Rev. William Salter, of Burlington, Iowa, delivered from the pulpit of the First Congregational Church a typical "divine judgment" sermon. He enumerated the national evils: national pride, intemperance, licentiousness, slavery extension, crimes against the freedom of speech and of the press. He asserted that national calamities were usually regarded as a judgment for national sins and believed that the evils upon the nation were to be viewed as a punishment for sin.[99] The Presbyterian position of the "Plan of God" was well elucidated in the editorial position of the *Evangelist* of New York, April 18, 1861. God had his own designs to fulfill. He caused nations as well as individuals to pass through great conflicts as a trial of national character and strength. Loyalty as a religious duty demanded the support of good government.[100] Several weeks after the call to the colors, the Rev. Mr. Strong of the North Baptist Church of Chicago delivered an address before the Illinois Rangers in which he pointed out clearly and conclusively that national sins

[98](New York: D. Appleton, 1932), pp. 96—103.

[99]*Our National Sins and Impending Calamities* (Burlington, Iowa: Hawkeye Book Office, 1861), pp. 4-7.

[100]XXXII, No. 16, 1.

have brought upon the nation deserved punishment.[101] "God did not mean we should escape war. He saw we deserved it, and he permitted the blindness and impiety which have brought it on," were the sermonic remarks upon the inevitability of war by the Rev. Albert Plumb May 10, 1861, at the Chestnut Street Congregational Church of Chelsea, Massachusetts.[102]

Tracing God in the historical process of the centuries, the Rev. S. J. Humphrey of the First Presbyterian Church of Beloit, Wisconsin, in his Thanksgiving sermon of 1861, said in substance that God planned the war to break the bands of slavery.[103]

Even Divine prophecy was invoked to offer a providential explanation of the conflict. In December 1861 the *Boston Advertiser* quoted "an eminent Baptist divine on one of the most striking instances of prophecy."[104] The modern prophet suggested this clever revelation and interpretation of the civil war scene.

> Behold there shall be a rebellion in the South, a rebellion of strong men and archers, of chariots and bright shields; . . . . And lo, behold, because of the sin of the South, her mighty men shall be as babes, her gates shall be destroyed utterly, saith the Lord . . . . her rice fields shall be wasted and her slaves set free. And behold, great ships from the North shall devour her pride, and a storm from the West shall lay waste her habitations . . . . her dominions shall be broken. . . . .[105]

The Rev. W. C. Whitcomb envisioned in a sermon an alliance of stupendous moral forces on the side of the North—Science, Literature, Humanity, Freedom, Civilization, and Christianity; with the "unseen warriors," the angelic hosts of heaven, and the spirits of "just men made perfect." This Thanksgiving sermon of 1861 was delivered at Lynnfield and Stoneham, Massachusetts.[106]

The evidence of "Providential Discipline and Punishment" was found in communities large and small, in both the East and West. Similar materials are available for other denominations

[101] *The Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* (Chicago), VIII, No. 37, 2.

[102] *The Congregationalist* (Boston), XIII, No. 76, 4.

[103] *Beloit (Wis.) Journal and Courier*, XIV, No. 27, 1. "God has taken care that this land should be peopled under the best auspices. He forged out the Puritan in the fires of persecution. He gathered out some of the choicest men of the old world with which to lay the foundations of the new empires in the West. He would not suffer them to land on the Southern coast, but drove them to the bleak shores of New England. . . . . Slavery was strengthening its bands. . . . . But God had better things in store for us. The time came. . . . . So the war came. . . . . "

[104] Quoted by *The Springfield (Mass.) Republican*, XXXVIII, No. 49, 1.

[105] *Ibid.*

[106] *Salem (Mass.) Gazette*, (December 10, 1861), p. 1.

than those mentioned — Baptist, Congregational and Presbyterian. It was part and parcel of the age-old belief of religion and religions, of the intimate relationship of deity, calamity, and punishment.

THE LOYALTY OF THE NORTHERN CLERGY

Through denominational resolution and program, pulpit sermon and patriotic address; through editorials and articles in the religious and secular press, and through community service at home and military service at the front; the vast number of Ministers of the United States revealed their loyalty to the Federal Government; an attitude of supreme hostility, disdain, and opposition toward the South. The minority whose loyalty was in question will be considered later.

The Rev. Peter Cartwright, famous veteran Methodist, circuit-rider, before the razing of Fort Sumter, offered to serve as a private at the front. "Old as I am, and stiff as I am," volunteered Mr. Cartwright, "I could shoulder my rifle now for the Union. . . . ."[107]

On April 26, 1861, the *Congregationalist* carried a news-story to the effect that on the previous Sunday it was doubtful if in all the world's history so many pulpits ever before, in a single day, spoke out in such thunderous tones, against treason and rebellion . . . . there was but one voice. . . . .[108] The *Evangelist* of New York stated that the Northern ministry was taking a stand worthy of the clergy of the revolutionary period.[109] The *Springfield (Mass.) Republican* asserted that the clergy were quite as much warmed up with patriotism as any class of people.[110] The *Schenectady (N. Y.) Daily News* added similar testimony regarding the religious press, that when Sumter was assaulted, diversity of thought on the Slavery issue was transformed into united support for the Federal Government.[111] *The New York Examiner* (Baptist) in a discussion of the "Pulpit and the War" stated that the pulpit spoke with unexampled unanimity, uniting its eloquence with those of the senate and the rostra.[112]

[107] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXVII, No. 5, 5.
[108] XIII, No. 62, 3.
[109] XXXII, No. 40, 2.
[110] XXXVIII, No. 18, 1.
[111] III, No. 40, 2.
[112] Quoted by *The Advocate* (Buffalo), XII, No. 598, 1.

"The Enthusiasm in *New York*—Scenes in the Churches," these headlines of news stories descriptive of metropolitan clerical patriotism, can be duplicated in Philadelphia, Chicago, and other large and smaller cities. At Broadway Tabernacle (Congregational) the Rev. J. P. Thompson spoke on the topic, "God's Time of Threshing." Dr. Bethune preached from the text, "In the name of our God we will set up our banners." At Grace Episcopal, Dr. Taylor's opening words were: "The Star Spangled Banner has been insulted." The congregation applauded the choral rendition of the national anthem at Dr. Bellow's church. Dr. T. D. Welles phrased his sermonic topic: "He that hath no sword, let him buy one." At Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, Dr. Beecher, the pastor, the patriotic offering was eleven hundred dollars.[113] At the time of the siege of Fort Sumter he asserted: "I hold that it is ten thousand times better to have war than to have human slavery. . . . . We can go into this conflict with a spirit just as truly Christian as any that ever inspired us in the performance of a Christian duty. . . . ."[114] On the last Sunday in April Dr. Beecher expressed gratification that the preaching had been so successful due to military results.[115]

"The Clergy on the Crisis" was the dignified title of an editorial in the *Philadelphia* press depicting clerical war attitudes. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Wood, preaching in the Roman Catholic Chapel declared that he dreaded war, appreciated national blessings, advised the loyal support of the Government in the spirit of forgiving opponents, and trusted God to protect the right. The Rev. J. G. Maxwell (Episcopalian) spoke on the necessity of sustaining the constituted authorities. The Rev. Father Strobel of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church dwelt upon the justice of the cause and the hope for the spirit of self-sacrifice. Dr. Kennard of the 10th Baptist Church organized a military company composed exclusively of members of his own congregation. Fifty were present at the first meeting, and

[113]The *Independent* (New York), XIII, No. 647, 1.

[114]J. R. Howard (ed.), *Henry Ward Beecher: Patriotic Addresses* (New York: Fords, Howard and Hulbert, 1888), pp. 276-87.

[115]*Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXVIII, No. 19, 4. ". . . . . of the Plymouth Society [a men's organization of his church], one hundred and thirty-five had gone, and were about to take part in the war. He did now know how well he had preached. They were 'living epistles,' and he was not ashamed that letters so written should be sent to Virginia. It was the duty of his Church to take care of its own sons, and their families. He had already distributed many of Colt's revolvers. . . . . The authorities would supply the soldiers with clothing and muskets; the Church must give them revolvers. A collection amounting to $2,565 was then raised for the equipment of the volunteers, and for the care of the sick and wounded."

a wealthy parishioner presented the group with a hundred rifles. No mention was made of the Friend (Quaker) churches in this story in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* of April 22, 1861.[116]

Two lengthy news stories vividly illustrating the attitude and influence of the *Chicago* clergy appeared in the *Daily Tribune* April 15 and 22, 1861. The reporter prefaced his story with a generalization concerning the loyalty of the Chicago ministry. At the First Congregational Church, the Rev. W. W. Patton said: "The present struggle is one in which every Christian may rise from his knees and shoulder his rifle." The reportorial comment was: "Seldom has a more hearty, earnest and eloquent, patriotic and Christian discourse thrilled the hearts of a congregation more than this. . . . ." At the Second Unitarian Church, the Rev. Mr. Robert Collyer delivered a timely sermon, which the reporter described: "Any one who looked upon the audience as these soul-stirring words swelled the air, was reminded that there is plenty of patriotism extant. . . . ." The Rev. Mr. Corning of Plymouth Congregational Church preached a "very effective discourse characteristically alive with living references to actual events."[117]

Chicago religion in the news filled two columns April 22d. The churches were thronged with worshippers to hear the pulpit war-utterances which were "with no exception such as sustains and stiffens patriotism, inspires patriotic fire in our soldiers, and sends them forth to a holy conflict with the enemies of freedom. . . . ." Dr. Everts of the First Baptist Church, denounced traitors; although several Southern sympathizers arose and left the service, the vast audience was thrilled by the pulpit eloquence. At the evening service in the Baptist Church there was an impressive "leave-taking" for three enlisted men. Dr. T. M. Eddy of the Jefferson Street M. E. Church declared: "We stand on the Bible, the Constitution, and the Declaration of Independence." The Rev. Dr. Patterson of the Second Presbyterian Church asserted: "Liberty must triumph." The Rev. Z. M. Humphrey of the First Presbyterian Church said: "The cause

[116]P. 2.

[117]XIV, No. 246, 1. "Nor, indeed, could it be expected that a sentiment and excitement so powerfully pervading the minds of their hearers, was to be overlooked by those who, from the sacred desk, act wisest when by living and vital cords of feeling, they guide and control the minds of hearers. There were some powerful and excellent allusions and improvements made of the war times in the pulpits of this city yesterday. . . . . There were few churches in which, either in prayer or discourse, the present war tidings were not feelingly and eloquently improved. . . . . "

which roused our fathers in the revolution was not so righteous (as the present). Rector H. W. Bacon of St. John's Episcopal Church averred: "Loyal obedience to her government, and proper maintenance of her integrity and honor" were essential. At St. Paul's Universalist Church, the Rev. W. H. Ryder conducted an impressive service, in the course of which the "entire audience was moved to tears and could hardly restrain their enthusiasm as the speaker contrasted the scenes at Lexington and Concord, April 19, 1775, with those in Baltimore, April 19, 1861." At a special service for the Chicago Dragoons at the Wabash Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church the pastor said to the departing troops: "Let every citizen become a saint, every saint a soldier, if need be, and every soldier a hero. . . . ." Great Union prayer-meetings were held in the afternoon and evening; at the latter Dr. J. L. Corning spoke to twenty-five hundred persons on "The Character of a Christian Patriot." Even at the Mission Sabbath Schools the "tiny tots sang, with a will, the 'Star Spangled Banner.' . . . ."[118] And so throughout the length and breadth of the North, patriotic religion and religious patriotism were in the ascendancy.

Expressions of loyalty through word or deed are manifested for the duration of the war, from clergymen of virtually all denominations (save possibly such pacifistic groups as the Friends, etc.) who served churches in cities, towns, villages, both large and small. (With some exceptions in the large cities and the border-state towns.) Disloyal attitudes are treated in a following section of this study.

The fall of Fort Sumter aroused the ire of the editor of the *Advocate* (Methodist) of Buffalo, who straightway penned a morale-stimulating editorial. He referred to the victory as astonishing, ten thousand against seventy, one hundred and fifty against one, a hundred turkey buzzards after one starved chicken.[119]

At St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church of New Haven, Connecticut, Father E. J. O'Brien admonished his parishioners to obey the church, the constituted authorities of their country,

[118] XIV, No. 252, 4.

[119] XII, No. 588, 2. "For the first time in our national history the American eagle is in the dust. An armed band of traitors have, by superior numbers, reduced a national fort, and have taken prisoners United States soldiers. We pity the American citizen whose cheek does not burn with shame under the degradation....."

and pray for peace.[120] The Rev. Warren Swift (Presbyterian) of Utica, Ohio, enlisted in the army shortly after the fall of Sumter.[121] The editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* would rather have every Union city in ashes, every railroad destroyed, and every third man in the nation perish, than allow the South to triumph.[122] The Rev. Prof. E. G. Robinson of Rochester (Baptist) Theological Seminary, New York, preferred that the entire population, white and black, of the South be swept away than have the Federal Government destroyed.[123] *The Boston Evening Transcript* noted the 100 per cent Americanism of the Rev. Mr. Studley (Methodist) of New Bedford, Massachusetts, who offered his services as a chaplain and whose powerful patriotic sermon was "the most eloquent and stirring . . . . ever delivered in that city."[124] In Chicago the preachers' homiletic efforts were applauded "loud and long."[125]

Secular and sacred press reports poured in from cities, towns, and hamlets, of clerical support of the Government, of condemnation of the South, and of offers of enlistment. The Rev. W. W. Sawyer of the First Baptist Church of Pekin, Illinois, denounced the traitors, rebellion, and treason in his sermon which was "listened to with the deepest attention, and the most profound silence prevailed. The discourse was well studied and well delivered and drew praise from every true heart who heard it."[126] Not only do we have the words of the preacher, but also the reporter's impression of the effect of those words upon his hearers. A New York Methodist parson of Genessee Conference, Niagara County, New York, proudly traced his genealogical devotion to the Union when he said:

> My grandfather fought through the entire war of the revolution. . . . . My own father volunteered in the war of 1812, and participated in some of the severest engagements. . . . . My only son, not yet twenty-one years of age, has already volunteered in the Light Guards. . . . . Yes and I am ready to sacrifice my life, if necessary, for the same object.[127]

[120]New Haven (Conn.) Daily Register, XXI, No. (None given), 2.
[121]*Quincy Whig Republican* (Ill.), XXIV, No. 4, 1.
[122](Cincinnati), XXVIII, No. 18, 4.
[123]*Ibid.*, No. 24, 5.
[124]XXXII, No. 9505, 2.
[125]W. T. Hutchinson, *Cyrus Hall McCormick* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1933), II, 34.
[126]*The Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* (Chicago), VIII, No. 402, 2.
[127]*Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXVIII, No. 20, 2.

The Rev. W. O. Wyant, a Methodist war-recruit, before leaving for camp, spoke at the Sunday School services of Roberts Chapel of Asbury (now DePauw) University at Greencastle, Indiana, concluding his talk with self-dedicatory remarks: "I have never felt more confident of my acceptance with God, than I do at this moment. The offering that I bring, I am willing to sacrifice on the altar of my country." At the evening service he consecrated his own son to the interest of the United States.[128] The Rev. Vincent Ridgely (Methodist) of Edgar County, Illinois, stopped short in the midst of a sermon saying: "Brethren, I cannot preach now. My country is in danger, and I must go to defend her. Let every man who loves the Stars and Stripes follow me." He was commissioned a Captain (not chaplain) of the Edgar County Volunteers.[129] Father Creedon, a priest of the Roman Catholic Church in Albany, New York, declared his patriotism in racial terms. He said: "I wish every man who can leave his family, to enlist. This is the first country the Irishman ever had that he could call his country. The flag of the stars and stripes is the only flag he can fight under and defend as his own flag. . . . ."[130] The far reaching influence of Northern Clergymen, radiating from their own congregations, to their communities, to the state and nation, is revealed in the widespread interchange of clerical news, from secular to sacred press and from religious journals to the week-day newspapers. This was well illustrated in the story of a 100 per cent loyalty when "a fighting pastor of a Congregational Church in Illinois . . . . requested authority to raise a company of infantry, and who (proposed) to enlist only clergymen. . . . ." This item from Illinois, was published in the *Recorder* of Boston, and reprinted in the *Presbyterian Herald* of Louisville.[131]

Not only to support the Union and condemn the South, but also the great task of the home pastor, was to sustain the morale of those at the home base in the face of military defeat. An example of the need of such strengthening was afforded by the Rev. Horace Bushnell of the North Congregational Church,

[128] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[129] Quoted by the *Springfield (Mass.) Republican*, XXXVIII, No. 22, 1.
[130] *The Congregationalist* (Boston), XIII, No. 107, 3.
[131] XXXI, No. 15, 2.

Hartford, Connecticut, shortly after the disastrous Battle of Bull Run in the summer of 1861. Speaking on the topic *Reverses Needed,* Mr. Bushnell said: "The main point for us now is to get ourselves ready for the grand struggle we are in . . . . receiving those settled convictions that will stay by us in all the changing moods we are to pass, and the discouragements we are to encounter . . . . to go over with a calm revision the matter of the war itself. . . . ."[132]

The Chaplain was the morale officer of the army, the representative of Christianity and the Church, who expressed the spirit of victory, and who restored the depression of soul in the time of defeat, in both officers and men. His was a unique opportunity also, to serve as a channel of communication to those back home. He not only preached with the sword of the spirit, but also on occasion fought with the sword of steel. A war correspondent described in June 1861, the conduct of the Brooklyn Methodist Chaplain Inskip, in action at the front.

> He is one of the best soldiers we have among us. It is a sight worth seeing when marching at our head with sword and sash. . . . . If we should go into battle he would be found at the head of our regiment, encouraging the boys by his presence, and at the same time doing good execution with his sword.[133]

The Rev. I. F. Jones, chaplain of the 1st Regiment of New York in the autumn of 1861 delivered an eloquent discourse before the troops, capped by a most dramatic climax. As the Chaplain exclaimed, "Are not the spirits of the departed patriots now hovering over us? . . . ." an American eagle soared from the adjacent woods, encircled the clergyman, paused over his head and departed. The effect on the regiment was electrifying.[134]

In June of 1861 the editor of the *Fall River (Mass.) News,* a visitor at the Washington Camp of the Rhode Island troops, described Divine Service as conducted by the chaplain. The Rev. Mr. Woodbury read in a clear rich voice an appropriate portion of Scripture, following an earnest prayer that God would be their guide and rearward, and their sure protector in the day of battle. The band then played "Old Hundred," and

[132](Hartford: Conn.: L. E. Hunt, 1861), pp. 8-26.
[133]Quoted by the *Advocate* (Buffalo), XII, No. 598, 1.
[134]*Springfield (Mass.) Republican,* XXXVIII, No. 43, 1.

never did the majestic notes of that grand old tune thrill the heart with deeper emotion.[135] A news item of July 1861, reported that Chaplain Woodbury was in the thickest of the fight and came off unscathed.[136]

In the latter part of the war, in commendation of the re-enlistment of veteran volunteers of the 10th Regiment of Connecticut, Chaplain H. Clay Trumbull said at St. Augustine, Florida: "You have filled well your place and performed fully your part, and in nothing have you done more to benefit your country than in this noble, new enlistment. . . . ."[137] Several months later he preached before his regiment on *The Desirableness of Active Service,* in which he sketched the terrific cost that must be paid in the saving of the nation.[138] The chaplain reached his climax when he illustrated his theme by referring to a man who had made the supreme sacrifice from their regiment.

> "I've given one life for liberty," said Corporal Wheaton of our regiment, in his dying hour, "and I only wish I could give another." . . . . Our country is to be saved, under God, by hard fighting. . . . . Our Regiment fights hard, fights well. Let it go forward. . . . ."[139]

As has been noted there were clergymen who served not only as commissioned chaplains, but in the rank and file as well. "Fighting Parson" Moody of the 74th Ohio was not a chaplain but a commissioned line officer and commander of his troops, a preacher who blended his clerical and military qualities in battle. As his men "went over the top," he inspirited their morale with the challenge: "Say your prayers, my boys, and give them your bullets as fast as you can. . . . ." In the heat of conflict, this Methodist minister was thrice wounded, and his horse was shot from under him. His men cheered him.[140]

Memorial services for those who fell at the front were conducted back home by the local clergyman, a means of comfort and consolation for gold star parents. *The Death of a Soldier of the Republic* was the theme of a memorial address at

[135]Quoted by the *Newport Mercury* (Rhode Island), CIV, No. 5363, 2.

[136]*Ibid.*, No. 5364, 3.

[137]*Good News* (Hartford: Case, Lockwood, 1864), pp. 12-16.

[138](Hartford: Case, Lockwood, 1864), pp. 12-16. "No cost is too great for success in such a contest. Even though men fall like autumn leaves; and even though every wife becomes a widow, every mother sonless, every child loses a father, and every sister a brother; even though the nation is bankrupt and gaunt famine stalks the land; better, far better, this, than peace before victory."

[139]*Ibid.*

[140]*Daily Commercial Register* (Sandusky, Ohio), XII, No. 184, 2.

the service of the late Captain Charles Chase Cloutman of the Second Iowa Infantry, who fell at the assault on Fort Donelson, in 1862. In the course of his remarks the officiating clergyman, the Rev. William Salter, of Ottumwa, Iowa, said: "Captain Cloutman went forth to this conflict from a sense of duty. . . . . The cause of Christian civilization, of human progress and of liberty is sanctified by his death. . . . ."[141]

The editors of secular and sacred journals further testified concerning the loyalty of the Northern Clergy. The editor of *The Trumpet and Christian Freeman Universalist Magazine* of Boston found the vast majority of ministers loyal to the United States, and bold to exterminate treason.[142] *The Methodist Quarterly Review* declared that among the important reasons given for the righteousness of the war was the fact that the leading denominations have uttered a clear and decided testimony in its support.[143] . *The Evangelist* (Presbyterian) stated that the pulpit and the religious press brought a high level of intelligence to the cause of the war. Together they have spread that deep conviction of the justice of our cause.[144] *The Advocate* (Methodist) found the secular press filled with sermons and sermonic extracts, with hardly a discordant note.[145] The *New York Observer* (Presbyterian) in 1864 noted that

> various ecclesiastical bodies have just held their meetings . . . . in all those bodies of Christian men and Christian ministers not one voice has been raised, not one vote cast, except in support of the Government and the Union. . . . . The Church is unanimously loyal. . . . .[146]

The Universalist was pleased to see how uniformly loyal the Religious Press proved in this great crisis of our country.[147] The prominent New York editor, Horace Greeley, likewise agreed that the Clergy were loyal. He wrote:

> . . . . the active, earnest loyalty of nearly every Christian denomination throughout the Free States has been most emphatically proclaimed. Apart from the Roman Catholic and the Anglo-Episcopalians, I know of no single com-

[141]P. 7.
[142]I, No. 19, 74.
[143](New York), XLV (July, 1863), 434-55.
[144]XXXIV, No. 48, 1.
[145]XIV, No. 724, 2.
[146]XLII, No. 23, 182.
[147]XLVI, No. 21, 2.

munion which has failed to affirm its entire sympathy with the Federal Government in its desperate struggle with Slaveholding Treason. . . . .[148]

By and large, the Northern Clergy in most cases officially, and in almost all other instances unofficially, loyally supported the Federal Government in the War between the States, and directly or indirectly opposed the cause of Southern Independence.

THE DISLOYALTY OF THE NORTHERN CLERGY

The term disloyalty when applied to the Northern Clergy during the era of sectional warfare includes a variety of ideas. It suggests pacifism or the abhorrence of the system and method of war in all its forms. It implies copperheadism or the lending of comfort and aid to the enemy. It denotes official denominational neutrality or the forbiddance of political and social questions in pulpit and conference affairs. It imports passive resistance or the refusal to observe patriotic amenities such as the display of the national flag, prayer for the nation, etc. It embraces concepts of sympathy for the enemy, inclusive of understanding, good will, toleration, and forgiveness. It imputes the clerical fear of the loss of the pulpit occasioned by substantial supporters being offended by the intrusion of distasteful economic issues in the minister's message. Disloyalty invariably meant hindering war progress.

While asserting that "the great body of the clergy of all denominations in the loyal States, have unquestionably been loyal to the General Government," Professor R. L. Stanton, a contemporary historian, also admitted, that

> not a few, among the men of ability and influence, have shown decided sympathy for the rebellion; sometimes in overt acts, often in speech and in their writings . . . . and sometimes by a reticence which has been quite as significant as by any open line of conduct. Some of this description have been required to take an oath of allegiance to the Government, which they have done reluctantly. Some would not take it, or their course was such that the alternative was not offered them, and they have voluntarily left, or have been sent out of the country. Others, whose acts have been deemed more highly criminal, have been imprisoned; while still another class

[148] *The Independent* (New York), XV, No. 751, 1.

> have been sent South beyond the lines of the Union armies. . . . . The more numerous cases . . . . are to be found in the Border Slave States and in the District of Columbia. . . . .[149]

Mr. Stanton also found that the only religious journal that did not support the Federal Government in its efforts to put down the rebellion was the *True Presbyterian* (successor to the *Presbyterian Herald)* of Louisville, Kentucky, a loyal, border slave state.[150]

"Treason in the Pulpit" was the subject of the correspondence of "H.J.E." to the *Christian Times and Illinois* of Chicago in May 1861. Most of such letters or news stories omit the name of the disloyal minister, the name of his church, the name of his town, exact quotations revealing specific ideas of treason, and the name of the witness, correspondent or reporter. In this instance a correspondent, whose initials are the only means of identification, received the information from an unnamed member of the Bloomington (Ill.) Baptist Church who attended the "disloyal" service, in an unnamed Baptist Church in an unnamed town in Southern Illinois, in which an unnamed Baptist minister spoke against the nation on the second Sunday of April 1861. No direct quotations are given, only such general statements as the minister "did rant and rave . . . . against the Government of his country. . . . . He justifies Secession in the South with all its enormous crimes, not even excepting the licensing of pirates on the high seas by the Southern Confederacy to prey upon our commerce. . . . ."[151] The correspondent hoped that the church would expel the clerical offender and that patriotic uprisings in the state and nation would make him leave for a warmer climate.

But there were other cases of disloyalty most painfully conspicuous and concrete in the mentioning of names of persons and places and charges. The *Springfield Republican* (Mass.) reported a news item suggesting clerical disloyalty in early May 1861, when Rector Henry A. Wise, Jr., of an Episcopal Church in West Philadelphia, Pa., omitted at Sunday worship the prayer for the President. In the midst of the liturgy, a Mr. Drexel, a

[149] *The Church and the Rebellion* (New York: Derby & Miller, 1864), p. 207.
[150] *Ibid.*
[151] VIII, No. 401, 2.

prominent parishioner, arose and requested the clergyman to repeat the prayer correctly. The Rector stood his ground, and was compelled to leave the pulpit, without preaching his sermon or finishing the service.[152]

In June 1861 a Roman Catholic congregation in Boston, rebuked their priest, Father Taylor, because of his disloyal remarks, that the conflict was a "politicians' war." They bluntly told him that such sentiments "could not be uttered in that church; that he must go South if he wanted to express them, and that no man could love the Lord Jesus Christ who did not love his country." We are not informed whether Father Taylor repented, avoided that topic in the future, or was transferred to another parish.[153]

In June of 1861 Alexander Campbell, a famous founder of the denomination known as the Disciples of Christ, indulged in unpatriotic if not disloyal comment upon the outbreak of war. Writing in his organ, the *Millennial Harbinger,* under the initials "A. C." he blasted the nation.

> Civilized America. Civilized United States. Boasting of a humane and Christian paternity and fraternity, unsheathing your swords, discharging your cannon, boasting of your heathen brutality, gluttonously satiating your furious appetites for fraternal blood, caps the climax of all human inconsistencies, inscribed on the blurred and moth-eaten pages of time in all its records.[154]

Undoubtedly Rev. Alexander Campbell shared pacifistic views which motivated his scathing condemnation rather than a conscious disloyalty.

New York City and Philadelphia received the spotlight of clerical disaffection in July and September of 1861. The Rev. Dr. Hoge, associate pastor of the famous Brick Presbyterian Church, and co-pastor of Dr. Gardiner S. Spring, resigned his position because of pressure due to his sympathy with the South. In his farewell sermon he paid his denunciatory respects to "political preachers."[155] Then the Rev. J. Poisal of the Bedford Street Methodist Episcopal Church of New York, left his pastorate and removed to the South "on account of his love of

[152] *Springfield (Mass.) Republican*, XXXVIII, No. 19, 1.
[153] *Ibid.*, No. 26, 1.
[154] (Bethany, Va.), IV, No. 6, 344-48.
[155] *Springfield (Mass.) Republican*, XXXVIII, No. 30, 1.

secession. He had previously refused to pray for the president and had reason to believe that he would not be much longer tolerated by a patriotic congregation."[156] Some weeks later, a news item succinctly stated that "Rev. W. T. Brantley, D. D., of Philadelphia has gone to Georgia, where his wife's family reside and are secessionists."[157]

In a religious journal of September of 1861, Charles Coffin referred to the opponents of the Federal Government and pro-Southern Northerners: "Scattered here and there through the Northern States are men who cry for peace, who deprecate the action of Government, who have a great deal to say about the 'unholy war.' They sympathize with the South."[158]

Whether this correspondent had in mind solely the Northern clergy or the Christian laity, or both, we are not told.

As late as October 1861, the Rev. Dr. Scott of Calvary Presbyterian Church of San Francisco, California, roundly condemned the "loyalty" resolutions of the San Francisco Presbytery. He even compared Jefferson Davis with George Washington, which according to press reports "inflamed public indignation." Dr. Scott shortly "asked for dismission from his pastorate."[159]

In the summer of 1863, H. P. Tuttle of Eagleville related a "copperhead" episode which occurred in an Indiana Church. Said Mr. Tuttle:

> On coming out of church at noon a Miss Jumper remarked to an intimate friend whose name was Dollarhide that she would appear much better in church without that butternut pin, whereupon Miss Dollarhide drew a large dirk and struck at her, but the blow warded off. She then advanced and struck again. This time the blow cut all the cords and nerves on the inside of the left arm. She struck a third time, a part of the dirk striking the breast bone—At this moment the two were separated by the friends of Miss Jumper. The preacher stood in the door witnessing the whole scene. When it was over he swung his hat and shouted at the top of his voice. 'Three cheers for Miss Dollarhide.' The next Sabbath after the above scene was enacted twenty-two ladies appeared at church with pistols and bowie knives in their belts.[160]

[156]Springfield (Mass.) Republican, XXXVIII, No. 30, 1.
[157]*Ibid.*, No. 37, 1.
[158]*The Congregationalist* (Boston), XIII, No. 149, 1.
[159]*Ibid.*, No. 174, 2.
[160]*Fremont (Ohio) Journal*, II, No. 33, 2.

In spite of the fact that Mr. Tuttle failed to mention the name of the minister, the church, and the community where the attack took place, an Ohio paper published the incident.

"Neutral Preachers" was the title of a significant editorial which appeared in the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati at the close of 1863.

> Neutral preachers are those who adopt what is termed the doctrine of non-resistance in the fullest sense of the term. . . . . Neutral preachers may be known by their eschewing any allusion to the state of the country in their preaching and prayers: Sanitary Commissions, Relief Unions, and kindred associations are ignored; yet, doubtless, they would have as much sympathy for the sick as any other men, if those suffering ones had not been engaged in this 'horrid war.' . . . . It is worthy of remark, that since the war began the number of neutral preachers has greatly increased. They were formerly confined to the Quakers, Tunkers, and Moravians, but now they are to be found where they were unknown before.[161]

The editor did not state whether he believed the increase of neutral clergymen was due to their sympathy for the South or their hatred of war or both.

A correspondent from Paris, Illinois, wrote in 1864 to the *Cincinnati Daily Commercial* concerning a pro-Southern Baptist minister in Illinois, who, instead of being driven from the town, received generous community support, although he was dismissed from his pulpit. The name of the minister, the church, and the town are given, Paris, Illinois, a town of 1,930 population in 1860 with twenty-two free negroes.

> The essence of man-run copperheadism in Illinois is concentrated in Illinois in Edgar County, and the town of Paris. . . . . There has been a secession in the Baptist Church of this place. The Rev. Mr. Yarnell, Pastor, was a virulent rebel, and thought it his duty to dilute his preaching of Christ, and Him crucified, with a large admixture of treason. The Church held a meeting and summarily expelled the Rev. Mr. Yarnell; whereupon the copperheads of Paris manifested a sudden and unaccountable interest in the welfare of the Gospel as preached by the Rev. reprobate. He adjourned from the church to the Court-house, and fulminated every Sunday to a stunning audience. A subscription was set on foot, and a new

[161] XXX, No. 49, 388.

> church edifice now nearly completed, will soon be ready for Mr. Yarnell's occupancy. The Baptist Church, South, promises to be a flourishing institution.[162]

Writing from observation and not from hearsay, the Washington correspondent of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati in 1864 set forth his impressions of the clergy of the national capital, who, by implication and innuendo, appeared to be neutral, indifferent, pro-Southern, and disloyal.

> I have visited nearly every pulpit in the city, and I have not been 'pained,' so far, by hearing from the Methodist, the Episcopal, or the Presbyterian pulpits, any such terrible words as slavery or emancipation. With the exception of about four preachers, I think myself safe in saying that the ministers here are not particularly set against slavery, nor much in favor of a vigorous prosecution of the war. Not longer than last Sabbath, in a Baptist congregation, I heard, in the opening prayer, 'Look, look upon all parts of our country, and bless our erring brethren of both sections, and grant that we of the North as well as our kinsmen of the South, may lay down the sword, and worship thee in peace.' Of course this is not the most positive way of using language, but it was positive enough to please the secessionists, not a few of whom were in the congregation. The mass of clerks who assemble each winter in Washington are generally from the East and North, and are men of anti-slavery principles, and when they become witnesses, as here, of a pulpit toadyism the most abject, it is not marvelous that they keep themselves in very disgust from the sanctuary. . . . .[163]

"Observer," also in 1864, reported the "war position" of two leading churches of Washington, D. C. Referring to Trinity Protestant Episcopal Church, he wrote that the said institution had "much wealth and pride, and is noted for its secessionist proclivities. Free speech in the pulpit, except on the side of pro-slaveryism, is not known or tolerated here. . . . ." Epiphany Protestant Episcopal Church was "less disloyal than Trinity, but both churches refused reading prayers for the President on the day named. . . . .[164]

[162] XXV, No. 44, 4.

[163] XXXI, No. 3, 17.

[164] *Ibid.*, No. 40, 313.

A "copperhead" story was printed in June 17, 1865, by the *Springfield Weekly Republican* (Mass.) under the caption: "Feud in Church of Rev. J. Van Dyke, Brooklyn." Whether the incident occurred before or after the close of the military hostilities, the writer did not disclose. Mr. Van Dyke refused to deliver a sermon until the Stars and Stripes had been removed from his church, the First Presbyterian of Brooklyn. He declined to read notices of benefit meetings for soldiers and was said to have "affiliated with Southern traitors." Mr. Dunham, a trustee of the church, had stigmatized his pastor as a "copperhead," whereupon the minister threatened a suit of libel but finally changed his action to that of forgiveness. The trustee refused absolution, asserting that he spoke the truth. That was the impasse of the feud between pastor and trustee.[165]

Dr. Henry Ward Beecher in 1862 declared that timidity was the reason why the neutral ministers did not preach the full Gospel on the subject of slavery. They were afraid of losing their pulpits. The introduction of social themes in the pulpit hurt business, and the big business men who liberally supported the church would not stand for such preaching. Dr. Beecher became specific when he asserted: "I do not believe that half the churches of Brooklyn are in such a state that their ministers would dare preach . . . . on the subject of the slave . . . . (the most influential men in the church) would not tolerate it. . . . ." Mr. Beecher felt that the pulpits of Brooklyn were far less constricted in this respect than in many other communities, although he believed that there were many churches in New England and the West which possessed the free pulpit upon the subject of slavery.[166]

That there was public pressure both within a church and in the community to silence anti-slavery pulpits in ante-bellum times, as well as loyal pulpits in the era of war, is discoverable in secular news stories. The unquestioned devotion of the Rev. Dr. Butler of Trinity Church, Washington, D. C., for the Federal Government in the fall of 1860 was the cause of a movement to oust him from his pulpit. The item in the *Springfield (Mass.) Republican* stated: "The secession members . . . . are trying to

[165]XLII, No. 24, 1.

[166]*Freedom and War* (Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1863), pp. 214-15.

get rid of their pastor . . . . because of his strong Union proclivities. . . . ."[167] A "public indignation" meeting was held in St. Clair, Butler County, Ohio, in 1863, as a protest against the super-patriotism of the clergy referring possibly to both the local clergy and the clergy of the nation. The crowd adopted the following resolution, that "the clergy of the present day are the Devil's select and inspired representatives preaching envy, hate, malice, vengeance, blood and murder, instead of love, charity, Christianity, Christ; and 'thereby receive our unqualified and indignant rebuke." Whether the clergy of the St. Clair or Butler County, or Ohio replied to that rebuke, was not given.[168]

But the throttling power of slavocracy and its Northern tentacles, was still manifest after the termination of the war, and the assassination of the President. A remarkable statement concerning "slavery domination" was given by the editor of the *Trumpet and Christian Freeman* (Universalist) of Boston in May 1865. He noted:

> We have seen but too many evidences that the accursed institution (slavery) still tyrannizes over even Northern pulpits. In the sermons and reports of sermons occasioned by the assassination of President Lincoln . . . . we have been pained in some instances, to notice how gingerly the cause of the awful crime is approached. Most of the pulpits . . . . have done their full duty; and . . . . have . . . . laid the responsibility where it alone can rest—on slavery. . . . .[169]

Disloyalty when applied to the Northern Clergy not only covered a multitude of sins, but probably included some virtues as well. How many ministers were guilty of disloyalty in the usual military and legal sense will probably never be known. The news-items in secular and sacred press treating this class of pastors do not bulk large in number. Many such accounts are highly unsatisfactory since they either deal in generalities or fail to provide the necessary specific data. However, an exhaustive study may disclose many more such clerics who did their part in aiding the Southern cause and prolonging the conflict.

SOUTHERN ATROCITIES CULMINATING IN ASSASSINATION

Northern clerical attitudes were highly colored intermit-

[167] XXXVIII, No. 43, 1.
[168] *Gospel Herald* (Dayton, Ohio), XIX, No. 28, 2.
[169] XLVII, No. 1, 2.

tently by Southern atrocity stories emanating from the realms of civil as well as military life. The Christian ministers of the North comprised a highly articulate group of leaders, mingling in their communities during the week, and proclaiming their divinely sanctioned civic views from the pulpit on Sunday, later to be published in the secular and sacred press. The atrocity story was dynamic sermon-fodder or editorial-matter in the hands of some clerical stimulators of the congregational and public emotions. Southern military methods, the disposal of the dead, the treatment of the wounded, the handling of prisoners, the strategy of the secret service, and the general attitude of the South toward the North and Northern soldiers, constitute the basic themes of these accusations.

"Rebel Atrocities" was the succinct topic of the editorial which appeared in the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati, April 23, 1862. The first Battle of Bull Run had been lost, Forts Henry and Donelson captured, and the victory achieved at Pittsburg Landing (Shiloh). This Methodist editor gave the source of his information but not the location of deeds of savage cruelty.

> We regret to see the confirmation of rebel atrocities practised on our dead . Members of the Committee on the Conduct of the War, at Washington, say it is true, according to the testimony of Governor Sprague (Governor of Rhode Island until 1863, U. S. Senator from 1863 to 1875; served with the Rhode Island troops at the First Battle of Bull Run and Peninsular Campaign), and many others, that in some cases the graves which contained the bodies of our soldiers were opened, and the bones of the dead carried off to be used as trinkets and trophies for secession ladies to append to their guard chains, etc., while skulls were used for drinking cups. Those of our dead interred by them were placed with their faces downward and in repeated instances buried one across another. The barbarities in respect to our dead are not, it is further said by the same authority, exceeded by any thing in the history of the last four thousand years, the details being savage practices.[170]

In essence this story stated that *in some instances* the bones were used as ornaments, and *in repeated instances* the mode of

[170] XXIX, No. 17, 132.

interment was barbarous. The editor implied that he had heard of atrocity stories before this confirmation of the same.

"Rebel Atrocities" was the title of a letter written by Chaplain A. H. Quint, Congregationalist, of Massachusetts, from Winchester, Virginia, to the *Congregationalist*, quoted by the *New York Observer* (Presbyterian), of New York City in the issue of May 8, 1862. The sources of this story were traced to the honor of an unnamed Virginia clergyman, and his anonymous parishioner, and the place of the inhuman deeds, the first Battle of Bull Run.

> A clergyman of this country, I will not give his name . . . . assures me on his honor that 'Yankee skulls' were hawked about this town after Bull Run battle at ten dollars a piece. Spurs, also, were made of jaw-bones, to his personal knowledge. A member of his own church, who was not at Bull Run, told him that hundreds of bodies were left headless, for such purposes. . . . .[171]

We are not told whether either "witness" saw the headless corpses on the battle-field or were present at the sale of such souvenirs.

"A Conservative," whose authority was virtually every newspaper he read, expressed his convictions in a letter to the *Congregationalist* of July 11, 1862. The only specific instance he gave was the horrible treatment accorded Northern prisoners in the Richmond prison (Libby). "Conservative" was a vivid compiler.

> We read in almost every paper of the horrible barbarities to the Union soldiers. One of our wounded troops had his ears cut off as he is dying, that they may be carried away as trophies. Another, as he lies bleeding and prostrate, had his skull crushed in by the heel of a confederate boot. Numbers who have been wounded are stabbed, in cold blood, on the battle field. . . . . Poisoned food and drink are set before our soldiers on the march. Union men are insulted, imprisoned, banished; and in one case a Union man of high character is crucified with his head downward, and pricked with bayonets, and mocked in his agonies, and then left to die by exhaustion and suffering, from which he is saved only by the coming of our army to his rescue. All these are well authenticated cases of Southern barbarity, to say nothing of such atrocities as

[171] XL, No. 19, 150.

> making skulls into drinking cups, and bones into finger rings, and teeth into necklaces, and scalps into collars—*all of which have unquestionably been done*—though how frequently cannot be known. And the treatment of Northern men taken prisoners, in the prison at Richmond, for example, is enough to make the blood run cold with horror. . . . .[172]

The Rev. Dr. Henry B. Smith of Union Theological Seminary of New York City, and the editor of the *American Theological Review* (New School Presbyterian) discussed Southern atrocities in that journal in 1862 which was quoted by the *Christian Secretary* (Baptist) of Hartford in the issue of September 9, 1862. No authorities for the evidence are given, and no locale stated.

> The barbarities inflicted on our Union soldiers by southern troops are atrocious; their skulls have been made into drinking cups, their bones into spurs and knife-handles, their gory heads hacked from their bodies, have been swung in fiendish joy from railroad cars and in triumphal processions. The helpless and wounded have been bayonetted on the field, and dead bodies dug up to be dishonored. . . . . Hundreds of those we took captive, and released on their oath not to bear arms against us have at once re-enlisted in their armies. Whatever is esteemed just, human and sacred among men has thus been trampled under foot at the bidding of that corrupt despotism which now bears sway in the revolted states. And all this is the legitimate and necessary result of the unchecked domination of the slave power. History does not record a more awful disclosure of the profound depths of human wickedness. . . . .[173]

Apparently the more remote the atrocity story from the original scene, the more highly embellished and gory. These accounts generally appear again in religious circles in 1864-65.

The Christian pulpit also publicized the atrocity story as well as the religious newspaper, the chaplain's war front correspondence, and the theological journal. Charging that the South buried "our dead face downwards with all possible indignities," the Rev. Edwin B. Foster in his Thanksgiving address at the First Congregational Church of West Springfield, Massachusetts, November 27, 1862, cited no authorities and mentioned

[172](Boston), XIV, No. 28, 109.
[173]XLI, No. 2011, 1.

no localities. He, nevertheless, revealed a vivid descriptive portrayal.

> They dig up the decaying remains and tear the scalps from the heads of the departed, as vultures tear the flesh, that they may make drinking cups of the skulls. With strange powers of invention, almost their own ingenuity of mechanism, they manufacture the bones of our dead into rings and castanets and whistles, then hawking them abroad, as an article of merchandise, they coolly pocket the thirty pieces of silver. . . . .[174]

The cruelty stories of 1864 stressed the inhuman treatment accorded Northern war prisoners, rather than the diabolical creation of skeletonized trinkets from battle-field remains. From 1863 on the number of such prisoners had increased enormously, and in 1864 tales of frightful conditions emanated from Libby Prison at Richmond, from Andersonville, Belle Isle, and other places of incarceration. "Retaliation" was the title of the editorial of May 6, 1864, which appeared in the *Congregationalist of Boston*. The editor advised his reader that "this sad and harsh word should have a practical meaning among us."

> We did not believe that the rebels, brutal as they had proved themselves to be, were in earnest in their threats to give no quarter to our black soldiers, or that they would dare so to outrage the opinion of the world, as to murder colored captives in cold blood. The events—appalling, and almost surpassing all credence—at Fort Pillow, however, have proved, if proof before that were wanting, that they did mean what they said. They have been as bad as their word. Deliberately . . . . they have butchered their prisoners by hundreds. Retaliation is now our reluctant duty. . . . . The President has declared his purpose to retaliate. . . . . We trust he will call out two rebel prisoners to every negro . . . . to immediate execution. . . . .[175]

"The Prisoners of War" was the caption of the editorial in the September 1, 1864, issue of the *New York Observer* (Presbyterian) of the metropolis.

> Since the breaking out of the slaveholders' rebellion, we have had, and the world has had, an opportunity of contrasting the treatment of prisoners held respectively by the Government of the United States and the authori-

[174] *The Constitution our Ark in the Storm* (Springfield, Mass.: Samuel Bowles, 1862), p. 26.
[175] XVI, No. 19, 74.

ties of the so-called Confederate States of America. The lesson is of vast interest and value. It unfolds character, condition, feeling, religion, civilization. It points a moral. It is a study for the historian, the philosopher, the Christian. . . . . On our part . . . . the most abundant, systematic, expensive, and humane provision has been made for their accommodation. . . . . On the other hand . . . . tales of cruelty, starvation, filth, vermin, disease, neglect, death. . . . .[176]

On December 2, 1864, the *Congregationalist* broadened the base of Southern atrocities to include secret service sabotage in civil communities. "The fiendish spirit of the leaders of the Rebellion, which has shown itself in robbery and murder of Unionists, in cruelty to prisoners of war, and in inhumanity toward the dead has just made a new development of the ingenuity of wickedness, in the attempt to fire the city of New York."[177]

In February 1865, the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati penned his editorial on the theme: "Retaliation." With conflicting emotions he felt that it was but natural that "the cruelties inflicted upon our captured soldiers by Southern hate should wring from our hearts a cry for vengeance."[178] But he advised caution in the practise of retaliation.

> We have thought of negro soldiers massacred and white ones starved; we have looked upon emaciated forms, and read of famine's delirium and its horrid death, till we could only pray with compressed lips and clinched fist. 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' has seemed but justice for these barbarous cruelties. . . . . Retaliation, however, is a dreadful resort, to be postponed as long as possible, and even then to be limited by the law of nations and the sentiments of humanity. We are not prepared to become brutes, because others have so debased themselves. . . . . We can never starve a rebel prisoner, though the rebel Government has starved ours. Above all, we can not take innocent men, some of whom have been forcibly conscripted into the Southern service, and reduce them to a condition as pitiable as that to which our remorseless enemies have reduced many of our sons and brothers. We will soon subdue this vile rebellion,

[176] XLII, No. 35, 278.
[177] XVI, No. 49, 194.
[178] XXXII, No. 6, 44.

> and the infamy of Libby, and Andersonville, and Millen, and Fort Pillow, will rest eternally upon the guilty and their cause. . . . . If the rebels then put our soldiers, black and white, at work in the trenches, we may put theirs at work. . . . . If they will put our officers under fire, let us put theirs under their fire, and if they choose to shoot them, the fault is not ours. But let us leave to them alone the base inhumanities that have so stirred the blood of the North. . . . .[179]

In March 1865 Chaplain A. McFarland of the 18th Illinois Mounted Infantry, stationed at Chrishasan Landing, Alabama, wrote an account of the treatment of Northern troops on a foraging expedition. All did not seem fair in war to the Rev. Mr. McFarland.

> Near Franklin, Tennessee, we were made aware of the presence of more of Kentucky's desperadoes. Some five of our men were sent out to get forage. They met some men dressed in our uniform, who decoyed them away from the command, and having made them prisoners, taking their horses, arms, rifling their pockets, took them out and deliberately shot them, leaving them as they supposed, to be dead, but one of them, after he loosened himself from his dead companions and although wounded came into camp. The four that were killed were from my regiment, and the one who escaped was from the 17th Indiana. We can meet on the deadly field of battle and see our men fall, but to have them killed in this way, raises the most violent passions of our nature and our men threaten vengeance on their perpetrators. . . . .[180]

But the event that crowned Southern atrocities was the assassination of President Lincoln. The tragedy appeared to Northern ministers a fitting climax of Southern cruelty and inhumanity. The Rev. Daniel C. Eddy of the Baldwin Place Congregational Church of Boston preached on the theme April 16, 1865: "The Martyr President." He believed that slavery had barbarized the South, was responsible for the Bull Run battlefield bone-ornaments, as well as for the inhuman treatment of prisoners at Libby and Belle Isle. He said that the prison atrocities were "perpetrated with the sanction of General Lee, under the eyes of the arch-traitor, in view of Southern clergy-

[179] XXXII, No. 6, 44.

[180] *The Christian Herald and Presbyterian Recorder* (Cincinnati), XXV, No. 2, 6.

men and Southern women. . . . ." He concluded with the assertion: "And now we have had another exhibition of it in the base, wanton assassination of the President. . . . ."[181]

Similar sentiments were revealed in the Memorial Address of the Rev. C. M. Butler, delivered April 19, 1865, at the Church of the Covenant (Presbyterian) in Philadelphia. Mr. Butler said:

> But whether or no this murder were devised or connived at by officials, it is assuredly but the legitimate result of what has been constantly taught and professed by all classes in the rebel confederacy. . . . It is the same spirit that buried our boys, after the Battle of Bull Run, with their faces downward, and converted their skulls into drinking-cups . . . which led to the systematic slow starving of our poor prisoners, in the midst of communities which we have learned were abounding with provisions, and in prisons which were in sight of churches, where bishop and priest knelt with Jefferson Davis, and called themselves miserable sinners, and then rose and lifted no finger to alleviate this unspeakable atrocity. And that which this spirit has so persistently preached has at length been practised. Our President has been murdered. . . . .[182]

The Lincoln Memorial Address of the Rev. Phillips Brooks was a terrific arraignment of the South. Speaking from the pulpit of the Episcopal Church of the Holy Trinity in Philadelphia April 23, 1865, the Rector blamed barbarous slavery for the iniquity of the Southland.

> Slavery was a barbarian institution . . . . the spirit that gave man the ownership of man in time of peace has found out yet more terrible barbarisms for the time of war. It has hewed and burned the bodies of the dead. It has starved and mutilated its helpless prisoners. It has dealt by truth, not as men will in a time of excitement lightly and with frequent violations, but with a cool, and deliberate, and systematic contempt. It has sent its agents into Northern towns to fire peaceful hotels where hundreds of peaceful men and women slept. It has undermined the prisons where its victims starved, and made all ready to blow with one blast their wretched life away. It has delighted in the lowest and basest of scurrility even on the highest and most honorable lips. It has corrupted

[181](Boston: Graves & Young, 1865), p. 17.

[182](Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead, 1865), pp. 24-25.

the graciousness of women and killed out the truth of men. . . . .[183]

The war was over but the Northern Clergy did not forget the atrocities. A most sweeping indictment of the South was hurled by the Rev. Joel F. Bingham of the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Buffalo, May 7, 1865. He summarized the war methods and military strategy of the South in comprehensive fashion.

> Look, now for a moment, at the Southern methods of prosecuting their public and civilized warfare, so-called, which the late climax of crime has powerfully illuminated. In Virginia, arsenic was thrown into the wells, where national armies were likely to pass; and the inhabitants of the country whom these armies had spared life and property, were employed to bring into the national camps and sell to these soldiers poisoned pies and fruit. Sheridan himself, early in the summer of 1864, barely escaped from a fatal dose, received in a similar way . . . . the wholesale massacres of hundreds and thousands of national troops after surrender, of wounded national soldiers, on the field of battle and in the power of the enemy, purposely left to welter and languish for days, without attendance or so much as the service of a drop of water for their terrible thirst; of unnecessary and cruel amputation, by rebel surgeons, with the double purpose, openly avowed, to punish and disable, of hospitals purposely set on fire, with sick and wasted national soldiers left, by scores, to roast and consume in a burning building . . . . great and peaceful cities fare remote from the armies in conflict, were secretly set on fire . . . . attempted destruction of moving railroad trains, filled with unarmed men, women and children . . . . the cruelest ocean piracies on record. . . . . But the blackest page . . . . the horrors of the rebel prisons . . . . pits of torture, where a deliberate, systematic, long protracted process of freezing, infection and starvation was coolly and unrelentingly carried forward upon tens of thousands of men taken in open battle. . . . . Our posterity will turn pale as they read the record. Mankind will execrate the story with everlasting curses, and confess that this alone were enough to consign the exploded slave-holders rebellion to the blackest abyss of human infamy. . . . .[184]

The Rev. P. D. Gurley was the pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington where Lincoln had

[183] *The Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln* (Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead, 1865), p. 18.
[184] *A Discourse; National Disappointment* (Buffalo: Breed, Butler, 1865), pp. 11-14.

attended divine worship. On June 1, 1865 this Presbyterian pastor spoke on the theme: *The Voice of the Rod,* in which he well summarized the accusation of Southern atrocities.

> We have seen it (the spirit of treason and slavery) strike at the life of the nation . . . . inaugurating and cruelly protracting a war . . . . chanting the praises of slavery . . . . cursing and denouncing and laboring to destroy a Union of States . . . . commissioning incendiaries to burn our largest cities in the night . . . . leaving our unfortunate and suffering prisoners without food and shelter till they died, or sending them back to us in such a condition, physical and mental, that it was a relief to see them die. And now at the last we have seen it cap the climax of all its crimes and atrocities by assassinating the man whose lips and life were vocal with the utterance, "With malice towards none, with charity for all." It is enough. . . . .[185]

The foregoing evidence of Northern Clerical attitudes at white heat toward the South covers the period from April 1862 to June 1865, particularly the years, 1862, 1864, and 1865. The sources are from the Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal, and Presbyterian denominations, in the States of Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. Clerical editors, chaplains at the front, and pulpit leaders, all contributed their share in broadcasting the atrocity story and stimulating the public mind against the South. While the Northern Clergy rather generally condemned the South because of slavery, secession, and the war, the atrocity story was uncommon rather than typical of the Northern clerical sermons, editorials, articles, and correspondence, even in the years 1862, 1864, and 1865. Nevertheless, the atrocity story exerted an influence through the medium of the Clergy that kept alive a breach between the North and the South in war-time and reconstruction days.

THE NORTHERN OBJECTIVES OF THE CONFLICT

According to the mind of the Northern Clergy, the War between the States was waged by the United States to: (1) Preserve the Constitution; (2) Defend the Federal Union; (3) Uphold Representative Government; (4) Abolish Negro Slavery;

[185](Washington: Wm. Ballantyne, 1865), pp. 13-14.

(5) Repel the Southern Conquest of the North; and (6) Settle sectional accounts. Not all the Northern ministers possessed a lengthy list of war aims which they recited upon occasion. One clergyman stressed one objective, while another felt certain the North struggled for a much different purpose. As the war progressed, the war-aims were accorded varied emphases. The Northern war-objectives and the clerical attitude toward the South were mutually inclusive, the attitude coloring the objective, and the war-purpose influencing the attitude.

In April 1861 the editor of the *Congregationalist* of Boston declared that the war-aim of the North was the preservation of the Constitution, while the Confederate States were waging an aggressive war for the propagandism of slavery to force the United States to recognize the corner-stone of their social order.[186] The editor elaborated upon the supreme value of the Constitution. He asserted:

> The Constitution is above price. It cost blood. It is the offspring of Faith. . . . . God has given us this gift, and it is our duty to keep it from the profanation of piratical hands, and to hand it down to succeeding generations unimpaired. God laid this responsibility upon us, and we must meet it. . . . .[187]

Then early in May he re-stated the war-aim: "We are fighting the battle of the age, for civilization against barbarism, for freedom against slavery."[188]

The demonstration of the capability of self-government was the Northern war-purpose, according to the editor of the *Congregational Herald* of Chicago in May 1861. It was not a question of party politics, nor of sustaining the policy of the Federal Government, nor of the extension or limitation of slavery, nor of the perpetuation of the Union but rather: "Is the American people capable of self-government? . . . ."[189]

The Congregationalist quoted the *Christian Intelligencer* in May, presenting a list of rights that the North should demand from the South, which might be viewed as a war-end, an adjustment of sectional grievances. The *Intelligencer* thought it was high time to give consideration to Northern rights, since for

[186] XIII, No. 62, 1.
[187] *Ibid.*, No. 66, 2.
[188] *Ibid.*, No. 70, 2.
[189] IX, No. 8, 1.

years the South had filled the ether with its demands respecting the rights of Dixie. The six-point list included: (1) The right to travel without molestation through all parts of the Union. (2) The right to collect debts in the South due citizens of the North. (3) The right to express political opinions through the press or in the ballot-box without fear of prescription. (4) The right to be Northern men with Union principles. (5) The right to feel that slavery is not a divine institution, to be perpetuated forever on the basis of American civilization. (6) The right to be Americans, and not secessionists.[190]

The settlement of sectional accounts or the opportunity for New England retaliation was implied as an objective in the strife, by the Rev. Zachary Eddy on the *Congregationalist.* His article on "New England and the War" summarized the complaints of that section against the South. He wrote:

> New England has a special stake in this war. . . . . For more than a generation we have been compelled to put up with insults and injuries from the South. . . . . Our courage, our religion, our morals, our manners, our very industry, have been reviled and spit upon; our public men—even our statesmen of world-wide renown have been slighted and maligned; our eminent citizens have been mobbed, almost murdered, in southern cities; our senators have not only been continually threatened with assassination, but struck down with bludgeons in the Capitol itself; we have been denounced as fanatics, derided as pedlers, posted as cowards, proscribed, insulted, trampled upon as a people. We have patiently borne the long persecution; because to us law and order were sacred and inviolable. We were willing to bide our time; and now our time has come.[191]

The highest appreciation of the American Constitution was quoted by the *Gospel Messenger and Church Record of Western New York* (Episcopal) of Utica from the *New York Observer* (Presbyterian) of New York City—was an implied war objective. "The Constitution is of more value than all the Presidents, from Washington to Lincoln; of more value than fifteen Souths or Norths; of more value than millions of lives and money."[192]

The defence of the Federal Government and the protection

[190](Boston), XIII, No. 73, 1.
[191]*Ibid.*, No. 85, 1.
[192]XXXV, No. 25, 98.

of the Constitution summarized the purpose of the Civil War in the mind of the Baptist editor of the *Christian Review* of Rochester, New York, in July 1861. It is not a war of conquest and subjugation, not a struggle for national aggrandisement, not a crusade for the overthrow of slavery but the protection of Government, Constitution, and Country.[193]

"It is simply, solely, honestly, for the defence of constitutional government,"[194] said the Rev. S. T. Spear in his sermon defining the war-aims, preached in July 1861 in the Madison Square Presbyterian Church of New York. It is not a warfare of one section against another, not a warfare against slavery, not a warfare for territorial conquest for the lust of subjugation and not a warfare for political ascendancy, for party preferences, but for the defence of constitutional government.[195]

In August 1861 the Rev. Jacob Dunn stated in a sermon delivered at Pleasantville, Ohio, that the war was "to rid the country of the accursed institution of slavery." The trend which was plainly disclosed in 1862, is seen in the change of emphasis in war aims, from the preservation of the Union to the overthrow of slavery.[196]

The United States went to war in 1861 to prevent the Southern political aristocracy from wielding a despotic control over the nation. That was the central idea of an address given by Dr. Crane before the Rockland County Volunteers in October 1861 at Haverstraw, New York. It is not conquest, not hatred of the South, not a crusade against Southern institutions, not a contending for a mere union of States. Dr. Crane said:

> You fight . . . . to keep the foot of a political aristocracy from the necks of Northern freemen. You fight . . . . that the Union may not first be shattered in pieces, and then the nation (may not be) enslaved by a despotism, unscrupulous, relentless, remorseless, as stern as death, and as cruel as the grave. . . . .[197]

"Although the liberation of the slaves was not an avowed object of the war, it would—in the event of the success of the North—be its certain result," explained Bishop C. P. McIlvaine

[193] XXVI, Article 7, 491-500.
[194] *The Evangelist* (New York), XXXII, No. 30, 2.
[195] *Ibid.*
[196] *The Crisis* (Columbus, Ohio), I, No. 29, 1.
[197] *Christian Advocate and Journal* (New York), XXXVI, No. 43, 337.

of the Episcopal Diocese of Ohio to a group of British clergymen, while on his diplomatic good-will mission in England in 1862.[198]

Five objectives were set forth as war purposes by the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York City in the summer of 1862.

1. To put down unprovoked rebellion.
2. For the unity of our country.
3. For human freedom.
4. For the peace of the ages.
5. For free government in our land and all lands for all ages to come.[199]

The Rev. Edwin B. Foster was certain that the South was attempting to conquer and rule the United States, and that the North must overthrow the vicious Southern oligarchy. Mr. Foster shared his convictions with his Thanksgiving Day congregation at the First Congregational Church of West Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1862. It was a question of either the constitutional authority of the majority or the despotism of the few over the many. Mr. Foster averred:

> The seceding States are fighting to subdue the North. It is not a war of boundaries, they purpose to have the whole. . . . . The leaders of the rebellion, the slaveholding oligarchy, purpose to rule or ruin the Republic; it has been their purpose for thirty long years. . . . . The seceding States are fighting to rule the North. . . . .[200]

In 1863 an editorial in the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati revealed the shift in the emphasis of war aims from Union-preservation to slave-liberation, undoubtedly inspired by Lincoln's emancipation program. The editor wrote:

> To emancipate the negro was among the least cherished designs of a loyal people of this country when they reluctantly took up arms against the Southern insurgents. . . . . The work of emancipation has gone steadily and rapidly forward. . . . . The musket is the real charter of freedom. . . . .[201]

This union of war-ends was disclosed in the Thanksgiving sermon in 1864 of Dr. Thompson of the Second Presbyterian

[198] *Daily Toledo (Ohio) Blade*, XV, No. 10, 2.

[199] XXXVII, No. 32, 252.

[200] *The Constitution Our Ark in the Storm* (Springfield, Mass.: Samuel Bowles, 1862), pp. 3-4, 26-28.

[201] XXX, No. 25, 196.

Church of Cincinnati, who declared: "The purpose of the war . . . . is . . . . to resist revolution, and preserve the very system which our fathers struggled through a seven years war to establish . . . . whether this land . . . . is to be henceforth the home of freemen or slaves. . . . ."[203]

The Northern Clergy shared a variety of views concerning war objectives from that of safeguarding the Constitution, the Union, the Government, and freedom to that of destroying Southern rebellion, political power, and slavery.

[203] *Cincinnati (Ohio) Daily Commercial*, XXV, No. 95, 1.

CHAPTER V

The Clergy and War Guilt and Peace Terms

Conciliation or Condemnation

WHO were the guilty and who were the innocent in the South as viewed by the Northern Clergy? What measures of condemnation did they suggest for the responsible and what procedure for the blameless? Did the Ministers of the North pronounce judgment in the spirit of such Biblical texts as "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," or "Judge not that ye be not judged," or "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do"? What were the peace terms proposed by the Christian Pastors north of the Mason and Dixon Line?

In assessing the war guilt and defining the conditions of peace, the Northern Clergy presented a variety of beliefs, opinions, and convictions. Some deal in general with the entire South, others with certain classes of the population, others with special groups, and still others with individuals. The key word that appeared to be paramount in their thought was justice.

About a week before Lincoln was shot, the editor of the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago, wrote an editorial on "The Taking of Richmond," in which he expressed the feeling of sorrow and contrition that such a conflict has been possible.

> While we rejoice, unspeakably, that the war is substantially over, it is a joy subdued by sadness. It is sad that there should have been such a war as has raged in this country during the last four years; sad to think how many precious lives the war has claimed and has taken; sad even to look southward and observe what a ruin rebellion has plucked down upon whole States. . . . . Yet let

> the triumph be a sober one; and let Christians, above all, remember that the Lord alone is "the God of battles." . . . .[1]

On Friday, February 14, 1865, five days after the surrender of General Robert E. Lee and on the very day the President was struck down, a most conspicuous, dramatic, and symbolic celebration was staged at Charleston, South Carolina, the raising of the Stars and Stripes over Fort Sumter, with Dr. Henry Ward Beecher as the speaker of the occasion, presided over by General Robert J. Anderson, who, as Major, had left battered Sumter with Colors flying four years previously.

In an address which lasted more than an hour, Mr. Beecher plainly and vigorously advanced his ideas of war guilt and peace terms.

> Let no man misread the meaning of the unfolding flag. It says government has returned hither; it proclaims, in the name of vindicated government, peace and protection to loyalty, humiliation and pains to traitors. This is a flag of sovereignty. The nation, not the States, is sovereign, restored to authority. This flag commands, not supplicates. There may be pardon, but no concession. There may be amnesty and oblivion, but no honeyed compromises. The nation to-day has peace for the peaceful and war for the turbulent. The only condition of submission is to submit. There is the Constitution, there are the laws, there is the Government. . . . . One nation under one government, without slavery, has been ordained and shall stand. There can be peace on no other basis. . . . . All that we ask is unswerving loyalty and universal liberty, and that, in the name of this high sovereignty of the United States of America, we demand, and that, with the blessing of Almighty God, we will have. . . . . An armed band of pestilent conspirators sought the nation's life; her children rose up, and fought at every door, and room, and hall, to thrust out the murderers and save the house and household. It was not a legitimate war between the common people of the North and South. The war was set on by the ruling class, the aristocratic conspirators of the South. They suborned the common people with lies, with sophistries, with cruel deceits and slanders, to fight for secret objects which they abhorred, and against interests as dear to them as their own lives.[2]

[1] XII, No. 33, 2.
[2] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXXII, No. 17, 129.

Then the clerical orator of the day arraigned the Southern political leaders and declared that the Divine Judge would some day pronounce judgment.

> I charge the whole guilt of this war upon the ambitious, educated, plotting political leaders of the South. . . . . A day will come when God will reveal judgment and arraign these mighty miscreants, and then every orphan that their bloody game has made, and every widow that sits sorrowing, and every maimed and wounded sufferer, and every bereaved heart, in all the wide regions of this land, will rise up and come before the Lord to lay upon these chief culprits of modern history their awful witness, and from a thousand battlefields shall rise up armies of airy witnesses, who, with the memory of their awful sufferings, shall confront these miscreants with shrieks of fierce accusation, and every pale and starved prisoner shall raise his skinny hand in judgment. . . . . And then these guiltiest and most remorseless traitors, these high and cultured men with might and wisdom . . . . these most accursed and detested of all criminals . . . . shall be whirled aloft and plunged downward forever and ever in an endless retribution. . . . . For the people misled—for the multitude drafted and driven into this civil war—let not a trace of animosity remain. . . . .[3]

An interesting, though undocumented, anecdote is given by Emmanuel Hertz in his *Abraham Lincoln, a New Portrait* to the effect that: "after reading those speeches, five of them which Beecher delivered in England, he (Lincoln) said to his Cabinet toward the end, that if the war was ever fought to a successful issue, there would be but one man—Beecher—to raise the flag at Fort Sumter, for without Beecher in England, there might have been no flag to raise."[4]

These views of the Baptist editor of the Middle West and the Congregational clergyman of the East represent the conservative and the radical clerical attitudes toward the South in the era before the murder of Lincoln. But section was no respecter of opinions, there being calm preachers in both east and west, and fire-eaters in both sections of the North. But the assassination in Washington greatly intensified and in many instances changed the views of the ministers.

[3] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXXII, No. 17, 129.

[4] Quoted by Lyman Beecher Stowe, *Saints, Sinners and Beechers* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1934), p. 293.

A temperate plea for understanding and patience was voiced by two Universalist clergymen, one sermon delivered before and one after the presidential assault. Preaching in the pulpit of the Universalist Church, at Barre, Vermont, April 9, 1865, the Rev. S. F. Bliss declared:

> We have no right to mingle with our gladness (at the close of the war) any emotions of exultation over our vanquished foe; any glorying in their shame. We ought to remember that we have been accomplices in the crime that has brought this ruin upon them.[5]

In his sermon on "The Nation's Bereavement" the Rev. J. H. Hartzell, Universalist, of Buffalo, on April 16th, a day after the passing away of the President, sought to calm the public anger. "Let us not be carried away to passion and feeling. . . . . We need in such a period as this the calmest deliberation and the highest judgment."[6]

That an attitude of clerical clemency toward the South was present before the assassination, but was transformed by that deed, is disclosed in the sermon of the Rev. Leonard Swain of the Central Congregational Church of Providence, Rhode Island. On April 15, 1865, he said:

> We had overpowered our enemy, and now we were to use magnanimity and mercy, and waving all further retribution, we were to leave him to be punished by his own reflections, while we on our part, hastened to welcome back to the family circle. . . . . All this is brought to an end at once and forever by the dreadful event which hangs all the sanctuaries of God in mourning to-day. . . . .[7]

From conciliatory clemency to stern justice epitomized the widespread change in the attitude of many Northern ecclesiastics. The Rev. Seth Sweetser of the Central Congregational Church of Worcester, Massachusetts, ably presented this view in his sermon on the *Death of Abraham Lincoln.*

> Treason and rebellion and barbarity have done their worst. . . . . It is right that justice should have its course upon desperate and incorrigible criminals. . . . . Let us pray that Government may be sustained in its duty, in its

[5] *The Universalist* (Boston), XLVII, No. 2, 1.
[6] *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1.
[7] *A Nation's Sorrow* (Providence: No. Pub. given, 1865), p. 7.

> whole, severe duty, true to the demands of justice, without abjuring the sentiments of humanity; that punishment may be righteously meted out to whomsoever deserves it, according to the spirit of law and the demands of right. . . . .[8]

This change was recorded by the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati in the issue of April 26, 1865. As a consequence of the attack on the President, he believed that

> the rebellion will get harder terms, and treason will receive more terrible punishment than they otherwise would. The cause of liberty will not be hindered, but helped. The nation will see now, as never before, the character of the monster with which we grapple in deadly conflict. . . . . The nation will hate slavery, henceforth, a thousand fold more than ever it has in the past; and rebellion and treason will be regarded as crimes, expiable only with death.[9]

In another editorial in the same issue entitled: "Hemp and Hell," the penalty was intimated in these words: "Mercy to the leaders of this rebellion is cruelty to the nation; but let them receive *justice* not *vengeance*. . . . ."[10]

But there was a minority in whom there was no change of heart toward the South. The Rev. Washington Gladden, then a young man, pastor of a Congregational Church in Morrisania, New York, declared in his sermon on the Sunday after the surrender of Lee:

> With our joy for the victory, there has been mingled a real sorrow for the army and the people of the South—a sorrow not only because they are called upon to suffer so terribly, but that they are made to pass through such humiliation. . . . . I most firmly believe that by a hearty and considerate kindness to the southern people we can restore the old relations of amity; nay, that we can establish new relations of friendship which shall be far closer and more enduring than the old ones were. . . . . There is room for the exercise of a true chivalry,—opportunity to show our southern friends that we know how tender a feeling is wounded pride, and how to treat it with the

[8] *A Commemorative Discourse on the Death of Abraham Lincoln* (Boston: John Watson & Son, 1865), pp. 27-28.

[9] XXXII, No. 17, 132.

[10] *Ibid.*

> gentleness and respect that are the only medicine adequate to its cure. . . . .[11]

Mr. Gladden possessed the same spirit when he spoke to a crowded church at the Lincoln Memorial Service. He plead:

> This assassination seems to have awakened in the breasts of all the people a disposition to use stern and severe measures to the end that such an act may not be repeated. My belief is that stern and severe measures, instead of preventing the repetition of such acts, will have a tendency to multiply them. . . . . I do not learn that a single word has been heard from the South justifying or applauding. . . . . It is easy enough at such times to gain applause by falling in with the popular current. A man has only to shout, 'Hang them! Crush them! Exterminate them!' and the ceiling will resound with cries of approval; but that applause is not worth having. Rather should the reason, the calm, unprejudiced reason, be appealed to; rather should these instinctive feelings be rigidly challenged and held in check.[12]

Mr. Gladden then rather sadly commented upon the reception of that sermon, that "of the few hundreds who listened, a score may have been convinced; but a voice like this affected the raging of the populace about as much as the chirping of the swallows on the telegraph pole affects the motion of the Twentieth Century Limited. . . . ."[13]

The Minister was probably right. He was possibly a lone voice crying in the wilderness of anger, resentment, and violence. When this quiet service in the little church is compared with the great open air Lincoln Memorial meeting held on the Green at New Haven, Connecticut, there was much greater reaction in the assembled multitude. Three prominent clergymen addressed this indignation meeting on Saturday, April 15, 1865, with Mayor Tyler, presiding. The general theme of the three clerical speakers was the dire need of justice, accompanied by emotional responses from the crowd, which was estimated at five thousand. After a prayer by the Rev. Dr. Bacon, the Rev. Mr. Eustis declared, in speaking of Lincoln:

> His assassination was the natural consequence of the spirit which has murdered so many thousands of our sons

[11] *Recollections* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1909), pp. 147-153.
[12] *Ibid.*
[13] *Ibid.*

and brothers on the battle-field, starved them to idiocy in prison, and dragged, within a month, a (wounded) officer from our own city to death in brutal ferocity. Shall these malefactors go unpunished? (Cries of 'No. No.') The blood of every loyal citizen from the humblest soldier in the ranks to the President of the United States, cries to God for justice against this foul treason. . . . . Above all, brand with infamy those who, in this community, have to-day hailed with joy the death of our great Patriot and let them be exiled forever from the communion of the good and the loyal. . . . .[14]

Dr. Bacon also shared his views with the throng.

The duty of the time in this great national grief is, not less than it was yesterday, the duty of conciliation. Let us conciliate if possible all who henceforth are willing to stand by one recovered country and one indicated constitution. I do not forget that there is a duty of justice against the authors of the rebellion. . . . . For others let there be amnesty. . . . .

But for those everywhere, especially here, who at such a time as this are rejoicing in assassination, and glad that the President has been murdered, let infamy and unrelenting contempt attend them while they live and be piled, like a perpetual monument, upon their graves. . . . .[15]

But it was Dr. Patton who rose to the occasion and achieved the climactic plaudits of the thousands.

. . . . Yes, vengeance belongs to God, but he had his human instrumentalities to carry out his vengeance. He will not allow this land to be polluted with the innocent blood unavenged, shed by these rebels. We must wipe it out. . . . . There is such a thing as public justice to be maintained and honored, and this is no place of sentimentalism, but for patriotism. (Applause.) . . . . I would call for two millions of volunteers. I would form them four deep, their right upon the slope of the Alleghenies, and their left upon the margin of the sea, with bayonets fixed I would order them to march and drive every man who would not shoulder his musket and join this advancing host into the Gulf of Mexico—for it will take all the waters of that deep gulf to soak out the treason and the blood of this rebellion. (Great Applause.) It has been said by some that if any man who will now take the oath

[14] *New Haven Evening Register* (Conn.) XXV, No. 89, 2.
[15] *Ibid.*

> of allegiance, we should take him to our heart. I am not quite ready for that. I doubt not that the mean wretch who assassinated Abraham Lincoln, would readily take the oath of allegiance to save his neck. I would have it well choked with hemp first. (Applause.) The men who have violated their oft repeated oaths of loyalty and hatched and perpetuated this rebellion, I would not trust their oath. Their conscience is so seared an oath will not stick to it. No if they are not hung, the mildest that we can in justice do them, is to put them on probation for the rest of their lives. . . . ." (Great and continued applause.)[16]

Others tried to blend conciliation with stern justice. The Rev. Henry L. Edwards of the Congregational Church of South Abingdon, Massachusetts, in June 1865 thus sought to unite the ideals of love with those of punishment. In his sermonic discourse he admonished:

> Let us strive to strengthen liberty, as we have conquered it; first, by walking humbly before God; and secondly, by observing the great law of love to man, of whatever nation, complexion, or superscription. Let us dare to be just. Let us do right, though the heavens fall. Let us hang high treason, or ostracise it; in some way exterminate it, to all eternity. . . . .[17]

Some Northern Ministers in their pronouncements concerning Southern war guilt and peace terms incarnated the Old Testament sentence of an "eye for an eye," while others exemplified the New Testament ideal of "Father, forgive them."

The Iniquity and Damnation of John Wilkes Booth

John Wilkes Booth became the Judas Iscariot of the Civil War in the minds of the Northern Clergy. He incarnated and symbolized slavery, rebellion, Confederate conspiracy, copperheadism, and Southern atrocity. He was representative of all that was wicked, vile, evil, and sinful in the South. Consequently his guilt implicated the Confederates and Confederates higher up, as well as his "lower" accomplices.

The Rev. Leonard Swain in his sermon of April 15, 1865, delivered at the Central Congregational Church of Providence,

[16] *New Haven Evening Register* (Conn.) XXV, No. 89, 2.
[17] *Discourse* (Boston: Wright & Potter, 1865), pp. 12-15.

Rhode Island, felt that the assassination was the result of slavery.

> . . . . this horrible deed of assassination is the deed and crime of slavery. The individual perpetrator is nothing. The nation scarcely cares to ask who he is, or what he is. He is the mere instrument, the hand which held the pistol, the life, the dagger, and the bludgeon. The arm, the body, the life, which nerved and directed that hand and struck with it the nation's heart, was slavery itself. . . . .[18]

The Unitarian editor of the *Christian Register* of Boston linked the assassination with slavery, and rebellion.

> John Wilkes Booth is the incarnation of the spirit of rebellion. Behold here the legitimate result of the barbarism of slavery. . . . . The murderer of Mr. Lincoln is a fit companion with the rebel chief Jefferson Davis, with the dagger of secession, stabbed the nation's head. The rebellion thus beginning in secession has ended with the act of an assassin and a parricide. . . . .[19]

That the murder was characteristic of slavery was the opinion of the Rev. Henry C. Badger (Congregational) of Cambridgeport, Massachusetts, in his sermon on *The Humble Conquer.*

> I cannot but believe that this assassin is of unsound mind. . . . . If the murderer was insane, then those who aided and urged him on were not, and his deed was the fitting, may it prove the final manifestation of slavery. . . . .[20]

The editor of the *Christian Herald and Presbyterian Recorder* of Cincinnati asserted: "We see in this assassination the ripe fruit of treason and rebellion. . . . . God permitted one traitor to act out the spirit which animates all. . . . ."[21]

That Booth was the tool of higher-ups, and they were the tools of Slavery was the conviction of the Rev. Wilbur F. Paddock, Rector of St. Andrews Episcopal Church of Philadelphia, Pa.

> But who was his (Lincoln's) murderer? . . . . Not that poor wretch, who, now horror-stricken at the deed he has done. . . . . He, indeed, was the tool, the agent in the

[18] *A Nation's Sorrow* (Providence, Rhode Island: 1865), p. 5.
[19] XLIV, No. 16, 62.
[20] (Boston: Wm. V. Spencer, 1865), p. 13.
[21] XXV, No. 4, 14.

> execution of this diabolical act, and ought when found to be punished according to the atrocity of his crime. But he was not the inspirer, he was not the soul of this murder. There were others much more guilty than he. . . . . Both were merely tools . . . . the originator and executor of this fearful murder. . . . . the Great Evil . . . . (is) the accursed Spirit of Slavery. . . . .[22]

Similar testimony was given by the Rev. J. G. Butler, Pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church of Washington, D. C.

> The poor, miserable, wicked assassin whose name is not worthy of mention, though he has gone out with a mark deeper than the mark of Cain upon him, and who cannot escape the justice that awaits him, was but the representation and instrument of the enemies of the Heaven-blessed Government, whose Head they have stricken down. . . . .[23]

The Congregational clergyman of Rockford, Illinois, the Rev. H. M. Goodwin, termed the assassination a "representative act, deriving its character from sources below and broader than individual wills that planned and executed it. The spirit of the Southern rebellion, the dastardly . . . . spirit of slavery is in it, and expressed through it. . . . ."[24] He then condemned the greater criminals than the assassin.

> Let the remained of wrath and punishment be expended not upon the lifeless body of the murderer, but on those living and breathing assassins at heart, who approve the deed and would have done it themselves if they had dared—on those still greater criminals who still roam at large the leaders and chief actors in the rebellion whose guilt of criminality in the Light of God outweighs that of this wretched instrument of their will, as the murderer of the peace and life of a nation is more guilty than one who murders an individual ruler . . . . the penalty be commensurable with the crime. . . . .[25]

The Rev. C. M. Butler of the Church of the Covenant (Presbyterian) of Philadelphia disclosed reasons for terming the murder representative. Abraham Lincoln had been a marked man for slaughter by the South.

[22] *A Great Man Fallen* (Philadelphia: Sherman & Co., 1865), pp. 18-19.

[23] *The Martyr President* (Washington, D. C.: McGill & Witherow, 1865), p. 7.

[24] "On the Assassination of President Lincoln" (The Goodwin MSS: Sermons, The Hammond Library of Chicago Theological Seminary), No. 393, pp. 11-12.

[25] *Ibid.*

> Whether or no this murder were devised or known or connived at by officials, it is assuredly but the legitimate result of what has been constantly taught and professed by all classes in the rebel confederacy. All their youth have been taught that it would be a noble deed to remove this monster from the earth. . . . . This system has converted gentle women into furies, and high-toned gentlemen into brigands. . . . . Mothers have magnified this spirit of murderous revenge, not against wrong, but against right's resistance to wrong, at the family board. They have talked murder. Politicians have shrieked it from the hustings; individuals have advertised for it in the newspapers; statesmen have declaimed it in the halls of legislation; generals have proclaimed it at the head of armies; the public journals have preached it with passionate iteration . . . . this assassination is but the conversion of the *Richmond Sentinel* from a literary to a literal bowie-knife, and of the *Examiner* into a revolver, wielded, not by a theoretical, but an actual assassin. . . . . Our President has been murdered. . . . .[26]

Mr. Butler, thereupon, would deal sternly with the spirit that incited this crime.

> Shall I call you to deal gently and forgivingly, I do not say with this assassin, but with the spirit which has been his evil inspiration? . . . . We must prepare ourselves for stern duties. While merciful and magnanimous to the misguided and the penitent, we must hew this Agag of unrelenting murder in pieces before the Lord. Not—God forbid!—in a spirit of revenge, not in unholy zeal for a holy cause, but in calm and indignant sorrow that such a spirit should appear among us, and such a duty devolve upon us, should this work be done. . . . .[27]

The Rev. E. S. Atwood, Minister of the South Congregational Church of Salem, Massachusetts gave other reasons for laying the guilt of the assassination upon the "leaders of the Rebellion, and their aids and abettors, North and South."[28] The South will greet this deed with boundless glee, was the belief of Mr. Atwood.

> The bells will clash merrily in the remnant of the Confederacy, and the blood-thirsty crowd will shout themselves hoarse with savage joy, when the tidings

[26] *Funeral Address on the Death of Abraham Lincoln* (Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead, 1865), pp. 24-26.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] *The Nation's Loss* (Salem, Mass.: *Salem Gazette*, 1865), p. 13.

> reach them, of their deliberate vengeance accomplished. The pious hypocrite who heads them, will stay long enough in his flight to dictate an order for Te-Deums to be sung in the churches. The boasted chivalry, the scum and refuse of humanity, will gloat large-eyed and eager-eared, over the details of the dying agonies of the great and good and wise President whom God has taken to himself. Their brutal shouts, borne on the far Southern winds should faint with the burden they carry. . . . . Woe, woe, to this land, if it lay not judgment to the line, and justice to the plummet. I ask for no vengeance. Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. But I plead for Justice, Truth, and Righteousness.[29]

Specific charges of criminal conspiracy was charged against the South by the Rev. A. S. Patton of the Tabernacle Baptist Church of Utica, New York. He also was assured that the South secretly approved the assassination.

> . . . . the bloody act of this assassin is of one nature with all the barbarous acts previously committed by savage traitors, and we know that in the South no later than December 1st, 1864, money was called for to be devoted to this very object,—the names of Lincoln, and Johnson, and Seward being given as the selected victims of assassination. . . . . Tell me not that the leading men of the South disapprove of these acts. Tell me not that they mourn for the death of Lincoln—it is what they have wished for, and their barbarous spirit led them to applaud the cowardly Brooks, so, in their secret souls they to-day approve the miscreant murderer Booth. . . . .[30]

Further accusations were made against the Confederate authorities and the Southern press as being the instigators of the agents who led the attack. The Rev. P. B. Day in his Memorial Discourse in the First Congregational Church of Hollis, New Hampshire, June 1, 1865, mentioned the implications of the trial evidence.

> Our first impressions was that the plot of assassination was confined to a few fanatics. But the evidence in the trial goes more and more to implicate the Confederate authorities, and the blame of the act does not rest so much on the immediate agents in the plot, as upon those who directly or indirectly encouraged them. Especially upon the authorities privy to it, and upon the disloyal press

[29] *The Nation's Loss* (Salem, Mass.: *Salem Gazette*, 1865), p. 13.
[30] *An Occasional Discourse* (Utica: Curtiss & White, 1865), p. 11.

> both North and South. . . . . It was Booth who shot the President; but Booth was educated for the deed. . . . .[31]

The abettors of the Rebellion, North and South, must also share the guilt of the assassin, thought the Rev. T. R. Howlett, Pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church of Washington, D. C. The responsibility for the crime rested

> . . . . not alone upon him who fired the fatal weapon. . . . . Not alone upon the miserable wretches now on trial for their complicity, but upon every . . . . abettor of the Rebellion. Ministers who have preached peace and conciliation when they meant aid and comfort to the foe. . . . . Upon all these as well as upon Confederate soldiers in arms and the greater conspirators, rests the blood that has been shed during the war. . . . .[32]

The Northern Clergy were virtually a unit in the belief that slavery was the impelling cause of the assassination, that the perpetrators were representatives or tools of Southern officials, examples, and influences, aided by Northern factors, and that the spirit which inspired the deed must be rigorously dealt with.

THE GUILT AND SENTENCE OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

Jefferson Davis was accorded the honor of being the great criminal, to be placed in the rogues gallery of history side by side with Haman of antiquity and Benedict Arnold of the American Revolution. His fate was to be either exile or the rope. He also embodied the total viciousness of the South: its way of life, government, conduct of the war, and the assassination of Lincoln.

"The Great Criminal is in our hands, what crime shall be laid to his charge? Guilty of treason, guilty of perjury, guilty of barbarity, guilty of murder—such is the indictment against Jefferson Davis,"[33] charged by the editor of the *Independent* of New York City. "He shall be written in history as the great criminal of modern times. . . . . If the Government shall not hang Jefferson Davis, then let it never hang another man while the world stands. . . . ."[34]

[31] *Memorial Discourse* (Concord: McFarland & Jenks, 1865), p. 18.

[32] *A Discourse* (Washington: Gibson Bros., 1865), p. 6.

[33] XVII, No. 859, 4.

[34] *Ibid.*

A "character" portrait of Mr. Davis was acidly etched in an article in the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist of Chicago.*

> Jefferson Davis is one of those cold, cruel, heartless men, born tyrants, who are incapable of one manly or generous sentiment. He is one of those men who can intersperse a lying message, or proclamation, with appeals to the Deity and pious ejaculations of thankfulness or prayer; one who can see without a pang, the horrors of a Libby or Andersonville; who will go on grinding their own axes, coddling their own favorites, pursuing their own selfish aims. . . . . Not only has he been the "responsible man" of the rebel "concern," but no doubt the chief instigator of the great crime from the start. . . . .[35]

The editorial position, in April and May 1865, of the *Universalist Magazine* of Boston stressed the view that Davis was "the head and front of the Conspiracy; the most responsible because the most intelligent of traitors; the official embodiment of treason; the instigator (as is believed) of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln; the murderer (beyond a doubt) by slow and cruel torture, of thousands of defenceless prisoners. . . . ."[36]

But the *Universalist* editor, of that denomination which takes its name from the doctrine of the salvation of all souls, universal salvation, did not prescribe the usual penalty for Jefferson Davis: hanging. Instead he suggested exile, for he felt that

> they (Davis and his cohorts in crime) must not live on the soil whose flag they struck to the ground. To these bad men, powerful only for mischief, the practical enemies of our race, a victorious nation must sternly, yet by no means unkindly, say "Begone." Let them escape . . . . Let them find an asylum in the despotisms of the old world. . . . .[37]

Shortly before the assassination of Lincoln, the editor of the *Congregationalist* of Boston pronounced this sentence upon Davis: "If Jeff Davis and those who have acted with him in these enormities unparalleled in all the annals of time, do not deserve to be hung for their crimes and for the atrocious consequences of these crimes, then surely 'the magistrate will bear the sword in vain.' "[38]

After the assault upon the President, the above editor disposed of the ex-president of the Confederacy in a consistent

[35] XII, No. 39, 3.
[36] XLVII, No. 3, 2.
[37] XLVI, No. 50, 2.
[38] XVII, No. 13, 50.

manner. "Hang him of course; can there be but one loyal answer? . . . . Let him be tried as a traitor, convicted as a traitor, and hung as a traitor. . . . ."[39]

The Methodist editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* of New York City was convinced that Davis "should be foremost . . . . whom the government shall make examples of public justice," giving the reason that "their impunity shall not be allowed to teach all after times that rebellion is only an adventure and treason but a venial offense. . . . ."[40]

The Unitarian periodical, the *Christian Examiner* of Boston, published an article which gloried in the fact that "the new reign of peace will be inaugurated by no political executions. . . . ."[41] But the writer excluded Jefferson Davis and associates from exemption. "The life of Jefferson Davis is a just and necessary forfeit to the law. And to his wretched accomplices, no more mercy can or need be shown than to criminals of that grade anywhere. . . . ."[42]

The editor of the Baptist periodical of Chicago linked Davis and his administration with the murder of Lincoln.

> It may never be known precisely, how far the rebel chiefs were aware of Booth's secret plans, or how far they actually instigated or favored the crime. Enough, however, has already leaked out to convince reasonable men that Richmond was not altogether ignorant of what Washington was to suffer. Months ago, the country learned by way of Richmond, and from lips, if not of Jeff. Davis, of one having his full confidence, that astounding news would soon be heard. Since the crime was committed, such portions of the assassin's correspondence as have come to light show that among the conspirators, conference with Richmond authorities was at one stage of the plot found necessary. The country and history will hold the Richmond junta largely responsible for the cruel, dastardly act that smote President Lincoln. . . . .[43]

The Rev. Richard Eddy, Universalist of Philadelphia, severely indicted Davis and other political and military leaders of the South.

[39] XVII, No. 21, 82.
[40] XL, No. 20, 156.
[41] LXXIX, No. 250, 134.
[42] *Ibid.*
[43] *The Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* (Chicago), XII, No. 36, 2.

> I regard him as a corrupter of our public morals, an enemy to our good, an unsafe and ruinous teacher of our young, who couples the names of Davis, Stephens, Stonewall Jackson, and Robert E. Lee, or any of the associates with anything that can appeal to American pride and honor. Let them have place with Haman of old, with Benedict Arnold of modern times, whose example offers nothing but warning, whose names are synonymous for all ignominy and baseness. Let their names, as 'the name of the wicked, rot. . . . .'"[44]

The Northern Clergy, who discussed Davis in their sermons, editorials and articles christened him the arch criminal, to be slaughtered as a guilty scape-goat for the sins of his people for which he was responsible. Hemp was a fitting adornment for this public example. There was also a minor amendment to the penalty of hanging; banishment or exile.

THE RESPONSIBILITY AND FUTURE OF ROBERT E. LEE

Robert E. Lee was accorded a full measure of censure by Northern Ministers, although he was not as sweepingly indicted as Jefferson Davis. This was undoubtedly due to the character, temperament, and spirit of the man, a more lovable personality than the president of the Confederacy.

"To Northern minds Robert E. Lee has been the soul of honor," were the words of the Methodist editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* of Cincinnati on April 12, 1865; "the nation wept with General Scott when he cast the die upon the wrong side. . . . . We respected him as a noble but misguided man. Now, however, a land full of sorrow will bring to his ears bitter imprecations for needless slaughter (twenty thousand within a few days on Virginia soil)."[45]

The editor then gave the reason for this needless slaughter for which he held Lee responsible.

> What could have led to this maddened course but the spirit of Southern honor, the spirit of the duel, of the bowie-knife, of the Lynch code? That recklessness of human suffering and life, born of a system of human bondage. . . . . Our admiration of Lee has been greatly modified by this wholesale slaughter.[46]

[44] *Three Sermons* (Philadelphia: H. G. Leisenring, 1865), p. 24.
[45] XXXII, No. 15, 116.
[46] *Ibid.*

To the charge of needless slaughter of his own troops, was added the accusation of starving Northern prisoners, although in this case Lee was believed to share that responsibility with Jefferson Davis. Said the editor of the *Universalist* of Boston: "Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee starved the soldiers captured by them in war. In what particulars are they better than their confederate, J. Wilkes Booth?"[47]

Lee was further guilty of dishonesty in breaking his oath of allegiance to the United States, thought the editor of the *Independent* of New York.[48] ". . . . there is nothing to fashion a hero, while behind the dramatic front of the unwilling partisan lurks the damning fact that Robert Lee deliberately, intelligently broke his oath of allegiance to his country. . . . ."[49]

Traitor was the most common word that was employed to characterize Lee. The Rev. Samuel T. Spear, a leading Presbyterian divine of Brooklyn, succinctly condemned Lee in his Lincoln Memorial sermon as follows: "General Lee . . . . is a traitor to his country and who richly deserves to be hung for his crimes. . . . ."[50]

As one of the greatest traitors, Lee was also a potential national assassin and a murderer. In the comparison of Lee with Booth, the Rev. Gilbert Haven, a Methodist minister of Boston, averred that Booth "was but the dagger's point; Lee (was) its polished handle; slavery the force that drove it home. The yet unharmed general attempted to assassinate a nation. . . . . He, too, is a murderer. Let us do justice to the greatest traitors of our land. . . . ."[51]

A single sentence disposed of Lee in the opinion of the Rev. J. B. Wentworth of St. Mark's Methodist Episcopal Church of Buffalo: "The greater his talents the greater his guilt. . . . ."[52]

Lee was further charged with being a rebel who struggled for a criminal purpose which was murder. This was in reply to the praise of Lee for his fighting ability and prowess.

[47]XLVI, No. 51, 2.

[48]XVII, No. 854, 4.

[49]*Ibid.*

[50]Bishop Simpson and Others, *Our Martyr President* (New York: Tibbals & Whitney, 1865), p. 293.

[51]*A Memorial Discourse* (Boston: James P. Magee, 1865), pp. 24-25.

[52]*A Discourse on the Death of President Lincoln* (Buffalo: Matthews & Warren, 1865), p. 30.

> We cannot bear to hear such men as Robert E. Lee, Judge Campbell, and others praised. The blood of our starved brothers, in different rebel prisons, cries out against them. . . . . It is no honor to be a rebel, and to have bravely fought. Fighting in support of crime is murder. . . . .

expressed the sentiment of Rev. Justin D. Fulton, pastor of Tremont Temple, Boston, who spoke on the theme of *Radicalism.*[53]

Preaching on the topic: "Considerations of a Restored Union" (I Samuel 7:2), in Plymouth pulpit, Brooklyn, in October, 1865, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher stated at some length his attitude toward Lee. In an apologetic for the Southern General he said:

> I have deemed unwise the many criticisms that were passed upon General Lee when he assumed the Presidency of Washington College. When his history is impartially written, it can never be covered up in an hour of weakness he committed himself wickedly to the cause of the rebellion. This is a blemish on his name that cannot be well effaced. But I cannot deny that since that time his course and career, from *his* standpoint, have been almost void of reproach. The great crime of rebellion remains; but, it being assumed that he was conscientiously convinced that it was his duty, where can you find aught to criticize in his general conduct? And when the war ceased, and he laid down his arms, who could have been more modest, more manly, more true to his own word and honor than he was? And when he was called to the presidency of a college, must he not accept it? . . . . As far as I am concerned, I was glad that he accepted the position; and I have reason to believe that the young men who are graduated under him, even though they were deficient on some points of political education, will be true and faithful to the government that they live under. Robert Lee is the last man in the South ever again to rebel or incite rebellion. And I tell you we are not making friends, nor helping the cause of a common country, by raising the names of eminent Southern men, one after another, into the place of bitter criticism. It is not generous. We are the stronger party; we have been successful; and if there is to be magnanimity anywhere, we are the men to show it. . . . .[54]

But the conciliatory attitude of Dr. Beecher represented only a minority of Northern Clergy. The vast majority shared the

[53](Boston: J. E. Tilton, 1865), pp. 39-40.

[54]Henry Ward Beecher, *Patriotic Addresses*, ed. John R. Howard (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1887), pp. 720-21.

opposite views, as typified by the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York City who said: "Of the chiefs of the slaveholders rebellion Gen. Lee has been the special object of mawkish tenderness . . . . it is too much to ask that so flagrant an offender (in the treatment of Northern prisoners) shall not escape entirely unscathed for his crimes."[55]

Lee was thus responsible for military slaughter, for the starvation of Northern prisoners, for dishonesty in violating his oath to support the United States, for being a traitor and rebel, and fighting in a criminal and murderous cause.

THE DESTINY OF OTHER SOUTHERN LEADERS

While John Wilkes Booth, Jefferson Davis, and Robert E. Lee received the greatest individual attention from their Northern clerical judges, there were also scattering references to other military and civil leaders of the Confederacy, as well as to certain classes and institutions of the South. Without doubt the group or class that was most roundly condemned was the conspirators of rebellion, the slave-holder-planter group, the political representatives of oligarchy, the social aristocracy—these terms being used almost interchangeably. This group was in political, social, economic, moral, and religious control of the Southland, and was deemed responsible for slavery, secession, war, the military conduct of the conflict, and allied activities.

A tribute to General "Stonewall" Jackson appeared shortly after his death in the editorial columns of the *New York Observer* (Presbyterian) of the metropolis of May 21, 1863.

> This distinguished rebel general . . . . no officer has won a more distinguished reputation since the war began . . . . the most useful, popular, and successful man in the Southern cause . . . . a man of fervent piety, of purity of life and character, he was conscientious as well as brave, and carried all the ardor of his soul into the bad cause to which he had given his life. . . . .[56]

A patriotic service commemorating the Re-Establishment of the Stars and Stripes at Fort Sumter, April 14, 1865, was conducted by the Rev. George Dana Boardman in the First Baptist Church of Philadelphia. Burning with conviction Mr. Boardman declared: ". . . . unquestionably, if ever the halter was a fit

[55]XL, No. 17, 132. [56]XLI, No. 21, 158.

instrument for ridding the earth of monsters, it is in the case of these murderous, fiendish traitors, who inaugurated and guided this colossal and gory treason. . . . ."[57]

Mr. Boardman then shared with his congregation the sentence of doom he would have suggested to President Lincoln if he had had the opportunity.

> But this is what I would say, could I catch the ear of President Lincoln: "Seize some island of the sea! But some province of Europe, Asia, or Africa! Prepare some Botany Bay! Banish these felons (Davis, Benjamin, Toombs, Cobb) thither! Establish a rigorous passport system, and make it impossible for them to enter this purified Republic. . . . . Let us do with them as the Lord did with the first murderer, and send them forth to be fugitives and vagabonds in the earth, setting a mark on their brows, lest any finding them should slay them. . . ."[58]

While there was a nominal number of clerical items of condemnation of Southern leaders before the assassination of the President, after that deed, a deluge of recrimination burst forth. *The Crime Against the Presidency* was the topic of the sermon preached April 16, 1865, by the Rev. William M. Blackburn in the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Trenton, New Jersey. In his homiletic effort he mingled Old and New Testament theology in his pronouncement of doom.

> God seems to be saying by this event (Lincoln's murder), Hang your traitors! Take your justice from David, and your mercy from Christ; for the mercy of the cross is founded upon the justice of God in the atonement. Another must take his place, and may God give Andrew Johnson sufficient grace to execute justice. . . . . My friends, I would not be vindictive. . . . . May their punishment lead them to repentance, and to the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world. May no degree of calm justice be withheld from them, but may they not be denied our prayers, nor the saving power of their God. My prayer is for their arrest, their punishment, and their salvation in death. . . . ."[59]

Let the law take its course for its own honor and stability was the gist of the discourse of the Rev. Charles S. Robinson in the First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, April 16, 1865.

[57] *Addresses* (Philadelphia: Sherman & Co., 1865), pp. 18-19.
[58] *Ibid.*
[59] (Trenton: Murphy & Bechtel, 1865), pp. 20-21.

> . . . . the law of the land should now take its course in relation to all the aiders and abettors of this infamous rebellion. . . . . Tired of war, longing for quiet, eager for trade, sickened with bloodshed, we were ready to say, let the criminals be pardoned, let all the penalties of the law be remitted. The next act in our national history was, in all likelihood, to be a general amnesty proclamation. . . . . (But now) Murder is done at the capital. . . . . Hence, there is no revenge in the popular heart today, but only retribution . . . . let the majesty of the law be vindicated upon them as traitors. . . . .[60]

As Mr. Blackburn was exceedingly clever in uniting the ideals of mercy and justice so Mr. Robinson made a keen distinction between revenge and retribution.

The Rev. J. B. Wentworth delivered a spirited message on the Presidential crisis April 16, 1865, at his own church, St. Marks Methodist Episcopal Church of Buffalo, and repeated it at the Lafayette Presbyterian Church of that city a week later. "These traitors are guilty of the highest crime known to human law," said the clergyman. He continued:

> . . . . to pardon their crime would be treason to civil justice; to remit their penalty, would be a gross outrage on public law; to let them go free, would be to give license to every species of disorder, and to unsettle the very foundations of political society. . . . . It is necessary that these great villains should be executed according to law, in order to impress upon the public consciousness the idea that Justice is the basis of the state. . . . .[61]

Ceaseless mistrust of Southerners was the conviction of the Rev. J. E. Rankin, pastor of the Winthrop Congregational Church of Charlestown, Massachusetts.

> Those who have been guilty of treason, those who have deliberately foresworn their allegiance to the government of their fathers, who have waged four years of relentless warfare against their country, have not only forfeited all rights as citizens, but have also vitiated and corrupted themselves that they never hereafter can be trusted as fellow citizens . . . . in the assassination of Abraham Lincoln—they (Southern leaders of conspiracy) have lost all prospect of recovering their estates, and their citizenship, and if adjudged guilty of the crime of treason, no

[60] *The Martyred President* (New York: J. F. Trowbridge, 1865), pp. 18-20.
[61] *A Discourse* (Buffalo: Matthews & Warren, 1865), p. 29.

> executive clemency will interpose for their pardon. The law must take its course; the people will demand this. And this is as it should be. . . . . Let them take the fate of felons. . . . .[62]

On April 23, 1865, the Rev. Henry Butler denounced the Southern conspirators and treason. Preaching in the pulpit of the First Congregational Church of Keeseville, New York, he asserted:

> Conspirators against national and individual life must be punished. Their lives are forfeit. Treason must be made so black a crime that the very word will be ominous. Our country under God's favor must be made securely one. But there is danger lest revenge, a passion always bad, should mingle with righteous indignation. America's spirit should be that of Samuel when he hewed the guilty Agag in pieces, sad, serious, determined, God-like. . . . .[63]

The Clergymen invariably found their justice, discipline, and punishment in the Old Testament, and their mercy, love, and forgiveness in the New Testament.

The Rev. Robert R. Booth, minister of the Mercer Street Presbyterian Church of New York City on April 23, 1865, spoke upon the topic, *Personal Forgiveness and Public Justice.* In the course of his discourse he distinguished between vindictiveness and justice:

> We have no right as individuals to be vindictive, but as a nation we must be just. . . . . It is the claim of justice that the authors of this tremendous crime of rebellion against the liberties of America, and of the enormous misery which has followed it, should be condemned and punished. . . . .[64]

The sermonic counsel of the Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, delivered in the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church of Troy, New York, April 23, 1865, was:

> I call upon government to put in force against these leading traitors the penalty of the law. And I would their gibbet were so high that every man North and South might see it from his housetop, and learn as he looks that treason is not safe for the perpetrator. . . . .[65]

[62] *Moses and Joshua* (Boston: Dakin & Metcalf, 1865), pp. 13-14.
[63] *God's Way of Leading the Blind* (Burlington, N. Y.: Free Press, 1865), p. 21.
[64] (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 1865), pp. 14-17.
[65] *A Sermon on the Assassination of Abraham Lincoln* (Troy, N. Y.: A W. Scribner, 1865), p. 37.

Alexander H. Stephens, one-time vice president of the Confederacy, was singled out for excoriation by the Rev. J. B. Wentworth, Methodist of Buffalo. ". . . . a more despicable traitor than he is not to be found in the whole South. He ought to be hung for his meanness and perfidy—if for nothing else. . . . ."[66]

Mr. Wentworth would condignly punish the traitor chiefs, and would forgive the common people of the South, their victims.

The Rev. Phillips Brooks, Rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity (Episcopal) of Philadelphia, on April 23, 1865, from the sacred desk flatly charged

> . . . . this murder, where it belongs, on slavery. . . . . The traitor must die because he has committed treason. The murderer must die because he has committed murder. . . . . Slavery must die because out of it, and it alone, came forth the treason of the traitor and the murder of the murderer. . . . . The new American nature must supplant the old. . . . .[67]

The guilt of the presidential assassin, and his immediate accomplices was extended to include the leaders of secession, and rebellion—under the general classification of traitors, conspirators and rebels—in the minds of Northern Ministers. In fact, it is difficult to distinguish sharply, at times, between the two groups.

Retribution, kindness, confiscation, exile, execution, in the spirit of justice, not vengeance, was the comprehensive destiny to be adapted to Southern groups, according to their motives and deeds, that the Rev. Stephen G. Tyng advised. Preaching at St. George's Protestant Episcopal Church of New York City he asserted:

> Our Government owe(s) it to the majesty of the nation, and to the authority of God, which they represent, not to allow such an abhorrent violation of human authority and safety to pass without a very clear and distinct retribution upon the guilty inciters and accessories in such a crime. Still, let not a spirit of individual vengeance be allowed to rear the monument to our fallen head (Lincoln). . . . . Let the widest possible door be opened for the exercise of kindness, and the utterance of welcome to those who honestly desire to return to the loyalty and

[66] *A Discourse* (Buffalo: Matthews & Warren, 1865), p. 31.
[67] *The Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln* (Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead, 1865), pp. 19-22.

> duty to the nation which they have outraged, and the government which they have insulted and despised. The intelligent leaders in this rebellion desire no pity from any human being. Let them go. Some other land must be their home. Their property is justly forfeited to the nation which they have attempted to destroy, and to the oppressed, over whom they have tyrannized and triumphed. . . . . If the just utterance of the law condemns them personally to suffer as traitors, let no life be taken in the spirit of vengeance. . . . .[68]

The hanging of traitors in the spirit of calm justice, was the suggestion of the Rev. Joseph P. Thompson of Broadway Tabernacle (Congregational) Church in New York City. Said he: "There can be no doubt that the leading traitors deserve to forfeit their lives for their crime. . . . . We must be careful to keep our hands clean of even the imputation of a passionate revenge. . . . ."[69]

The elimination of all clemency and mercy for traitors, and the making of American soil too warm for their feet, implied execution or exile—in the thought of the Rev. Robert Lowry (Baptist) of New York City.

> We have lost all sentiment of clemency. Satan overleaped himself when he lifted the deadly weapon. If we indulged mercy to rebels before, now we have none. There is one deep, loud cry for justice! It needed the assassin's foul deed to nerve us to the punishment of traitors. . . . . This land is not large enough to hold the leaders of the rebellion. The flag they have sought to dishonor should not be allowed to cover them. They have forfeited, a thousand times over, the mercy of the government they assailed. And this last and vilest culmination of their crimes puts them beyond the possibilities of pardon—Let us make this soil red-hot to the foot of every traitor. . . .[70]

Other ministers of the metropolitan area of New York City united in the demand for the punishment of the assassins and the leaders of the rebellion, to serve the needs of justice and righteousness, to raise up an eternal example of dishonor and perfidy, in the spirit of divine not human vengeance. The Rev. J. E. Rockwell, Presbyterian, said: "God's law lays upon us its demands that these murderers should die, not to gratify a thirst

[68] Bishop Simpson and Others, *Our Martyr President* (New York: Tibbals & Whiting, 1865), pp. 82-83.

[69] *Ibid.*, pp. 209-213.

[70] *Ibid.*, pp. 314-15.

for revenge, but that all coming ages may read a lesson of justice and righteousness in the punishment of treason and rebellion. . . . ."[71] The Rev. Albert S. Hunt, Methodist, declared that punishment was a universal obligation.

> Shall traitors be welcomed to our fellowship? Shall we longer hug a sentimental theory of clemency? . . . . No! a thousand times no! We will not be vindictive, nor revengeful, but, God helping us, we will be just. . . . . At least we will demand that the leaders of this rebellion shall suffer the extreme penalty of the law in death. This is duty. We owe it to ourselves, to coming generations, and to God. . . . ."[72]

The Rev. Henry J. Fox stated that failure to punish was sinful.

> It is our prerogative to punish. . . . . Not to do this is weakness and a sin against society and against God. But to take vengeance; to indulge in a spirit of revenge, to visit upon the innocent it may be as well as upon the guilty, the consequences of this great wrong doing, is not Christian, it is not politic. . . . ."[73]

The Rev. Henry B. Smith averred that eternal punishment was inevitable for unpardonable crime.

> If there is a crime, there must be a penalty. It is wrong to the innocent to let the guilty escape. . . . . If these leaders live it must not be in this land; those that plotted and fought to destroy their country must henceforth be without a country; and through dishonored lives, with the mark of Cain upon them, go down to unhonored graves. . . . . Their names must be forever named with those of Cataline and Nero, and we will teach our children, and they theirs, to carry them down through all coming time as the dread symbols of an unequalled perfidy and an unpardoned crime against humanity itself. There are some crimes that a nation cannot forgive. . . . ."[74]

The stability, welfare, and security of the United States thus impelled severe punishment for the Southern leaders of rebellion and their confederates in crime.

Even Bishop Matthew Simpson of the Methodist Episcopal Church, officiating at the Memorial Services for Abraham Lincoln at Springfield, Illinois, taking the Lincolnian text: "With malice towards none," proceeded to sit in judgment upon the Southern leaders, demanding swift punishment.

[71] Bishop Simpson and others, *Our Martyr President* (New York: Tibbals & Whiting, 1865), p. 281.
[72] *Ibid.*, p. 327. [73] *Ibid.*, p. 352. [74] *Ibid.*, p. 378.

> Let every man who was a senator or representative in Congress, and who aided in beginning this rebellion, and thus led to the slaughter of our sons and daughters be brought to speedy and to certain punishment. Let every officer educated at the public expense, and who, having been advanced to position, perjured himself, and turned his sword against the vitals of his country, be doomed to a traitor's death. . . . . Men may attempt to compromise, and to restore these traitors and murderers to society again. . . . . But the American people will rise in their majesty and sweep all such compromises and compromisers away, and will declare that there shall be no safety for rebel leaders. . . . .[75]

The Northern Clergy continued their attacks against the South in June of 1865, upon the same general theme: divine justice to inflict a severe penalty upon traitors. The Rev. Richard Eddy of the First Universalist Church of Philadelphia favored calm justice not heated revenge.

> Justice shall have its course with those who instigated and led this Rebellion. I speak not of revenge, certainly not of wild and furious retaliation. . . . . I would have no unlawful exactions, no mere vengeance, but the justice which comes from judicial trial, the execution of the penalty which the law has provided for treason. . . . .[76]

The Rev. E. S. Johnston, Pastor of the Second English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, insisted that God's vengeance be executed.

> As you look upon this awful tragedy, learn to estimate aright the crime of treason, and permit no false magnanimity to lead to attempt to ward off the vengeance which God has plainly indicated shall be poured out upon the leaders of the rebellion. Vengeance belongs to God. To us as a Government he has entrusted the execution of his punishments on the guilty. It is neither wise nor safe for us to arrest the vengeance which does not belong to us, but to God.[77]

We conclude with the Thanksgiving sermon, 1865, of the Rev. A. E. P. Perkins, of the East Congregational Church of Ware, Massachusetts, who demanded that certain Southern political leaders never again hold public office.

[75]Bishop Simpson and others, *Our Martyr President* (New York: Tibbals & Whiting, 1865), p. 409.

[76]*Three Sermons* (Philadelphia: H. G. Leisenring, 1865), p. 23.

[77]*Abraham Lincoln* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Theo. F. Scheffer, 1865), p. 11.

> The idea that such men as Breckenridge, Yulee, Benjamin, Hunter, Mason, Toombs, Slidell, and others like them, infamous for perjury and treason, should ever, by any possibility, appear again in the halls of Congress, or upon the judicial bench, or should represent us in foreign courts, as they may do if they are restored to their full civil standing, is too great an outrage to every sentiment of decency and patriotism, ever for a moment to be entertained. . . . .[78]

It was ever execution, or exile, or confiscation, or loss of civil rights.

THE DECEIVED MASSES OF THE SOUTH

Early in 1862 the Northern ministers made a careful differentiation between the leaders and masses of the South concerning their war guilt. The aristocratic oligarchy, which included the wealthy planters, the large slave-holders, the influential politicians, army and navy officers, and substantial business-men —these were deemed the instigators, promoters, and directors of slavery extension, secession, rebellion, and war. They controlled, manipulated, and brow-beat the masses into obedience to their will. They dominated the South, socially, economically, intellectually, politically and religiously. Consequently the intelligent leaders should be dealt with severely, while those they have duped, betrayed, and deceived should be pitied and forgiven. The Northern Clergy could not conceive that the overwhelming population of the South would knowingly forsake the Union.

The editor of the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago in February 1862 made this careful distinction between leaders and followers in assessing war guilt.

> If ever a people were deceived, the people of the South, those who compose the rank and file of the Southern army are so. . . . . The real guilt of this fratricidal war rests with the men who have made these unfortunate persons their dupes. . . . . It is through them that the bitterness and ferocity that have characterized the South in this struggle find expression. They have hounded on the ignorant rabble for wicked purposes of their own. The chief men amongst them have designedly misrepresented the

[78] *Thanksgiving Sermon* (Boston: T. R. Marvin & Son, 1865), pp. 25-29.

> whole tone and intention of Northern sentiment for years back, and are the real authors of this Civil War. . . . .[79]

The editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati, in April 1863, stated the masses of the South were themselves beginning to realize they had been deceived.

> The people (Southern) are beginning to see that their real oppressors are the Southern leaders of the rebellion. . . . . We have always pitied the ignorant masses of the South. They have been deceived into the belief that they are fighting for liberty. They are beginning to find what kind of liberty it is that they are gaining, and when they come fully to comprehend who their real enemies are, and the real enemies of liberty, they will make short work of them. . . . .[80]

The editor of the *Congregationalist* of Boston in March 1865 was convinced that the Southern "leaders if they are caught, or submit themselves, ought to suffer the extreme penalty of the law," but that "with the misguided and helpless masses we hope the utmost lenience will be used that shall be consistent with appropriate justice. . . . ."[81]

"Shall They Be Punished?" was the editorial query of the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston in May 1865. The editor shared fraternal sympathy for the masses of the South, but disdain for treasonable leaders.

> For the great mass of those who have been misled we have the deepest sympathy. They are our brothers. . . . . In the hour of victory we extend the olive branch to the masses at the South, and upon their return to a loyalty pledge a hearty welcome to all the benefits of our free Republic. Brothers they were; brothers they shall be. To the leaders—those who planned and incited men to carry out this gigantic crime—we say, you are the instigators and the guilty. On your heads falls the solemn consequences of treason. . . . . Let the guilty be punished.[82]

The pulpit clergy shared the opinions of their literary clerical brethren. At a public indignation meeting on the New Haven Green April 15, 1865, occasioned by the attack on the President, the Rev. Mr. Eustis declared: "Forgive the ignorant rabble, but suffer not the chief conspirators to go unpunished. . . . ."[83] The

[79] IX, No. 28, 2.
[80] XXX, No. 13, 100.
[81] XVII, No. 13, 50.
[82] XLIV, No. 20, 78.
[83] *New Haven Evening Register* (Conn.), XXV, No. 89, 2.

Rev. Dr. Bacon who spoke before the same crowd agreed with the sentiments of Mr. Eustis.

> I do not forget that there is a duty of justice against the authors of the rebellion—the chief conspirators and traitors whose crimes it were a mockery and with justice to pardon, and I desire with you that upon them justice may be done. For others let there be amnesty if they will accept it and be faithful to the Union. . . . .[84]

The Rev. Leonard Swain preaching at the Central Congregational Church of Providence, Rhode Island, on the theme: *A Nation's Sorrow,* advised punishment for leaders and mercy for the masses.

> Let the leaders of the rebellion, or a suitable number of them, be tried, sentenced, and executed for treason, as by the laws of the land ordered and provided; then justice, having had its place, and the majesty of the law having been honored, mercy may have its exercise, and the people of the rebellious States be forgiven. . . . .[85]

Personal Forgiveness and Public Justice was the sermonic subject of the Rev. R. R. Booth of the Mercer Street Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia. He developed his philosophy of justice and mercy in some detail.

> It is not indeed requisite that the strict letter of the law should always be observed in meting out punishment. Extenuating circumstances continually modify its application. But unless the ruling purpose to honor the law and to administer government in the interest of justice, the State is always in peril, and anarchy lies in wait at the door. . . . . We have no right as individuals to be vindictive, but as a nation we must be just. . . . . It is the claim of justice that the authors of this tremendous crime of rebellion against the liberties of America, and of the enormous misery which has followed it, should be condemned and punished. . . . . There is a nobler conquest yet before us at the South—the conquest of light, and love, and generosity, and pity, over all those who have been misled by ignorance or maddened by lying words, or drawn into force by the mad rush of battle. . . . . As solemnly as we are called to punish deliberate transgressors, are we called upon to shelter and protect the ignorant transgressor. . . . .[86]

[84] *New Haven Evening Register* (Conn.), XXV, No. 89, 2.
[85] (Providence: Central Congregational Church, 1865), p. 8.
[86] (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 1865), pp. 20-21.

A brother minister, the Rev. G. D. Boardman of the First Baptist Church of Philadelphia, summarized his own convictions and those of many, and possibly most, Northern clergyman as follows: "But while I would thus sternly dispose of the leaders, and arch-conspirators, I would speak words of forgiveness and good to the multitudes they have duped. . . . ."[87]

Therefore the Northern Clergy would punish a very small number in the South in proportion to the total white population.

THE FALSE PROPHETS OF SOUTHERN CHRISTENDOM

The Northern Clergy who registered their opinions had supreme contempt for the Ministry of the South. Not even the hated planter slave-owner class was as roundly despised. It was a clash in Christian theology, philosophy, doctrine, dogma, morals, and conscience as well as Biblical exegesis. Thus the apostate Southern spiritual leaders were the outstanding adherents of slavery, the chief supporters of secession and war, and the matchless propagators of sectional hatred and cruelty.

The editor of the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston characterized Southern preachers as the

> . . . . most unreasonable of our enemies. They have outstripped the petty politicians and the so-called statesmen of the Confederacy in the malignity of their utterances. There is no class of men, who, when the war is over, will be so completely 'hung up to dry,' as the downeast raftsmen say when a log gets stranded, for they have spent so much time as apologists of the criminal facts of slavery that their vocation will be gone, when blacks and whites, hiring the same pew together, demand sermons of brotherly love. . . . .[88]

In the same year, 1864, an editorial appeared in the *Congregationalist* of Boston entitled: "Disloyal Southern Clergy." The occasion was the compulsory oath administered to them by the well known General Butler, a policy with which the editor was in accord. He spoke of the great influence of the Southern pulpit and how it was employed for nefarious purposes.

> The pulpit here (Southern), more than at the North, is the educator of the people. They remained true to their allegiance till the pulpit led the way to the dark gulf of

[87]Addresses (Philadelphia: Sherman & Co., 1865), pp. 19-20.
[88]XLIII, No. 9, 33.

> disunion. The minister of the South went mad on slavery, and prepared the people for what they believed to be a holy war. . . . . It is fit that judgment should begin at the house of God, for here the moral contagion that has infected the people, had its origin.[89]

The *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* stated editorially that the "most unqualified and violent pro-slavery men have always been ministers. . . . . The ecclesiastical leaders in the South are as hard, and determined, and hostile, as at any time during the war. . . . ."[90] this view as of June 1865.

The Rev. Lyman Abbott speaking in New York City at the close of the war paid his respects to the apostate clergy of the South.

> But as for me, I would rather trust the Southern soldier, and as readily receive the Southern politician, as reinstate the Southern clergy. . . . . We can not trust the Gospel of liberty and humanity to Dr. Hoge in Virginia, or Dr. Palmer in New Orleans. We might better intrust the civil government with Vance in North Carolina. . . . .[91]

In September 1865 the *Christian Secretary* (Baptist) of Hartford, Connecticut, described the continuing devotion of the Southern Clergy to their late cause.

> The assertion that the clergy of the South adhere more obstinately to the lost cause of rebellion than the politicians is doubtless true. They went into it on principle . . . . that it was their duty, in order to save the divine institution of slavery, and they have not yet given up the argument, although divine Providence has abandoned the institution . . . . we make the record with no malice toward the parties concerned, but we do earnestly wish that they might see the error of their position, and abandon it. That they will see it if they live long enough, we have no doubt. . . . .[92]

While the Christian Ministers of the North heartily condemned the Christian Clergymen of the South, the most drastic punishment that they intimated was not hanging, or exile; but that they should change their "slavery opinions," or that the New South would leave them "high and dry," or that they should not be reinstated in their Christian work. The Northern

[89] XVI, No. 12, 46.
[90] XII, No. 45, 2.
[91] *The Home Missionary* (New York), XXXVIII, No. 7, 160.
[92] XLIV, No. 2259, 1.

missionary conquest of the South to transform the Gospel of Slavery into Freedom, was in reality an attempt to punish the Southern Ministry.

PEACE TERMS

On April 13, 1865, the Rev. Thomas Laurie presaged that the glorious Northern victory might be lost through a conspiracy of crafty politicians. Preaching in the pulpit of the South Evangelical Church of West Roxbury, Massachusetts, Mr. Laurie eloquently described the universal appreciation of peace.

> A rebellion vaster, fiercer and more defiant than earth ever saw before, has just received its death blow. . . . . On Monday, when the news spread from city to city, and from house to house, men were besides themselves with joy. Words would not give it utterance; only the loudest music, and the thunder of cannon, could give expression to so great gladness. Never before did I get such an idea of mere sound as an expression of emotion, and if the multitudes that thronged the city streets last Monday could only have come together, and all joined in one of the grand old chorals, we should have heard such singing as we are not likely to hear this side of heaven. . . . .[93]

Then Mr. Laurie with keen Scotch insight saw the impending danger of the demagogue, that the objectives of the conflict might easily be lost rather than achieved.

> . . . . the war is virtually ended, but the results to be produced by it are not yet secured. We stand in the very crisis of destiny. The great questions that have so long agitated the nation are now approaching the final settlement. They have passed out of the sphere of force into that of debate, and not debate only, but political management, party strife and sectional prejudice. . . . . Is there no danger that while good men give themselves up to the intoxication of the hour, scheming politicians and worthless demagogues may plot unhindered? . . . . The whole South must be leavened with the Gospel. Its educational and religious institutions must be reconstructed, not by arbitrary dictation, but by a loving cooperation. . . . .[94]

Many were the varied and detailed peace programs that Northern preachers incorporated in their sermons, that religious editors included in their editorial columns, and clerical war commentators suggested in their articles.

[93] *Three Discourses* (Dedham, John Cox, Jr., 1865), pp. 6-7.
[94] *Ibid.*

The editor of the *Universalist* of Boston on April 15, 1865, insisted that Christian motives dominate a peace program.

> First, we must remember, that in the settlement with the conspirators, and those they have misled, all thought of revenge, all desire for revenge, must be repressed. . . . . Amnesty and pardon for all that may be safely restored to citizenship, is the imperative requirement of Christian statesmanship. . . . . Christianity, statesmanship, and expediency alike demand, that the victors be as charitable and as magnanimous, as the future safety of the disenthralled Republic will permit. . . . . Let them (pulpit and religious press) by protesting against every form and any degree of the spirit of retaliation in dealing with the humbled and defeated foe. . . . . We are Christians—we must feel and act as Christians.
>
> Secondly, we must deal with the foe with an eye steadily directed to the future safety of the redeemed nation. The intelligent conspirators, the wilful and ambitious leaders of the blind, cannot safely be trusted again; therefore they ought not to be trusted. . . . .
>
> Thirdly, we must educate the people we have conquered. We must give them the school and the church. . . . .
>
> Fourthly, the laboring class (negro) must be prepared for freedom. . . . .[95]

The Rev. Daniel C. Eddy spoke April 16, 1865, on *The Martyr President* at the Baldwin Place Congregational Church in Boston and strongly urged a peace policy of retribution.

> It is time we were aroused to the necessity of more decided action, and prompt vengeance. We have been throwing grass at the rebels, while they have returned steel and lies. . . . . I trust we are now to have an administration of justice — of retribution! . . . . It is plain that the leaders in this rebellion must be executed or banished. The Union is not safe if they are allowed to stay here. . . . . The sooner the screws are put on, the better for the nation and the better for humanity. . . . . Over the grave of Abraham Lincoln let this nation demand a reign of retribution. . . . .[96]

On the same day the former war chaplain and commentator, the Rev. Alonzo H. Quint, delivered a sermon on *Southern Chivalry* at the North Congregational Church of New Bedford,

[95] XLVI, No. 50, 2.
[96] (Boston: Graves and Young, 1865), pp. 17-19.

Massachusetts, which proved to be one of the most vitriolic attacks on the South made by a Northern Pastor. In this homiletic arraignment Mr. Quint demanded that "the land be cleansed of persistent sullen rebels and households."[97] He elaborated upon the idea of exile.

> Carry your perjuries to other shores; England is a good place for you. This land is sick of your presence. You are a stench in the nostrils of honest men. Go, Virginian descendants of transported convicts. Go, you who have lived by oppression and robbery. Never return. Your heritage is gone. Return, and the rope awaits your first step upon our shores. The land of convicted rebels should be taken. . . . . Break up their estates. There are Union men by scores of thousands, who have been robbed of their all. Repay them from Southern property. There are millions of unpaid laborers at the South. Give them their arrears of wages. Place them in the lands of their birth, as owners. There are soldiers who deserve well of their country. Give them each a tract of land. . . . . The men that have caused this war,—leave them landless and penniless, to do what they have despised us for doing, earn an honest living by the sweat of the face. . . . . In the fear of God Almighty, let us never pander to treason. Let the land be cleansed. Let the sword and the scaffold do their righteous work. Let treason die, that the country may live. By prayer, and vote, and our right arm, let us say, treason must perish . . . . let Southern Chivalry be destroyed, root and branch, twig and leaf. . . . .[98]

Exile, confiscation, and hanging summarized Mr. Quint's peace proposals for various Southern groups.

The Southern hatred of the North intensified and was deemed a dangerous barrier to speedy peace terms. On April 19, 1865, the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati discussed this hazard to a peace settlement and advised a fair and firm policy of restoration of citizenship rights.

> Everywhere south of a certain line, from earliest childhood, the people have been taught to despise us. Hatred of Yankees has not been begotten of the war so much as the war was of it. Indeed, we believe that our firm and unflinching defense of the Government, our bravery as soldiers, the sacrifice of ease, wealth, all things

[97] (New Bedford: Mercury Job Press, 1865), pp. 43-45.
[98] *Ibid.*

> for what we deemed right, has engendered in the Southern heart a regard for us never before felt. Yet the old animosity remains; strengthened by its unfettered expression for the last four years. It is deep and bitter, because it is inbred; it is haughty and tyrannical from habit; it is disappointed and soured by defeat, and, withal, suspicious that we have no other spirit than its own. She has doubted and distrusted every concession, every promise, every kindly word, and such is her nature that she will continue to do it. . . . . We have subdued rebellion, but when that shall cease there is no subjugation. . . . . No unkindness, no recrimination, no upbraiding, but the benefits of citizenship only to those who are worthy. We owe this duty to the safety of the republic. We can not take a viper with unextracted fang into our bosom. But the South understands it — she will respect us for our position. . . . .[99]

In an Easter Sermon of 1865, military occupation of the South was advised even for a period of a quarter of a century, until there was repentance. This was the peace plan of the Rev. G. S. Weaver of the Universalist Church of Lawrence, Massachusetts. He saw the impure spirit of the South as a great hindrance to regeneration.

> There is a terrible black and murky residuum of vice and malice in the pro-slavery heart of the nation South, which will ferment disorder for years . . . . our work of regeneration . . . . may perhaps be the more thorough for this great crime (assassination of Lincoln). . . . . Our danger was in a false magnanimity . . . . in a weak tenderness to conquered rebels. . . . . Moderation must wait. We must not hurry back the conquered States. Let them show works meet for repentance. Let them serve an apprenticeship under military rule. Give them a strong master till they learn obedience. And so taking time, twenty-five years if need be, reconstruct rebel territory slowly and surely. . . . .[100]

On April 23, 1865, the Rev. Gilbert Haven of the North Russell Street Methodist Episcopal Church of Boston laid down in his sermon a comprehensive and drastic peace program. The dethronement of rebellion leaders, and the enthronement of the negroes with the climax of suffrage, seemed to be the keynote of his plan.

[99] XXXII, No. 16, 124.
[100] *The Universalist* (Boston), XLVI, No. 52, 1.

> We must not only nor chiefly punish the rebellious leaders. This may be our primary, though not our principal duty. The loyal freedman must have his full rights as a man. . . . . The conditions of the rebel and his former slave, excepting slavery, must be reversed. No citizenship for the rebel leaders, perfect citizenship for his slave. No land for the chiefs of the rebellion, homesteads for his loyal bondmen. Expatriation, which was urged upon the negro, not three years ago, must be enforced upon his master. . . . . Outlawed homeless, exiled, let these once mighty rulers of the land expiate their crime of treason, while their victims take their homes and crowns. The first shall be last, and the last first. . . . . Whatever be the fate of the rebel, the enfranchisement of the negro alone can renew that land. What can make them (aristocrats) powerless (through) negro suffrage. . . . .[101]

A Northern dictatorship over the South until the spirit of the North dominates the entire nation, was the "Program of the Future" set forth by the editor of the *Independent* of New York City on May 4, 1865. He felt that the present state of conditions in the South jeopardized a permanent satisfactory peace.

> . . . . the North must remain the absolute Dictator of the Republic until the spirit of the North shall become the spirit of the whole country. . . . . The South is still unpurged of her treason. Prostrate in the dust, she is no less a traitor at this hour than when her head was erect. . . . . They (rebels) cannot be trusted with authority over their former slaves . . . . (or) over the recemented Republic. . . . . We trust that the Administration will not be in too great haste to beckon the wolves back into the sheepfold. . . . .[102]

A more tolerant policy was expressed in May 1865 by the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati. Instead of employing such terms as military control or dictatorship, he substituted the words Constitution, welfare, and safety. He declared that the South was "not to be regarded as a subjugated province" but that "as soon as public safety (would) permit must be governed by the civil statute, and not by the bayonet."[103] He then developed his peace plan as follows:

> In other words, the people of the insurgent States must be left again to govern themselves, subject only to

[101] *A Memorial Discourse* (Boston: James P. Magee, 1865), p. 23.
[102] XVII, No. 857, 4.
[103] XXXII, No. 19, 148.

> the restrictions as the Constitution and the National welfare demand . . . . nor is there any desire on the part of the people of the Northern States to interfere in any purely local or State question which may arise in the South. They are prepared to go for "the Union as it was and the Constitution as it is," provided that slavery be abolished in the fundamental law, and that secession and treason be rendered impossible henceforth and forever. . . . . To restore popular governments to States largely pro-slavery and rebellious, so as to secure liberty and obedience to the Federal Constitution. . . . . Disloyalty disfranchises . . . . (there must be) no restriction of suffrage on account of color or previous condition.[104]

The chief plank in the peace program of the Rev. Joseph P. Thompson of Broadway Tabernacle (Congregational) Church of New York City, was the deprivation of the Southern conspirators' property and citizenship to force a voluntary exile on their part, and to conciliate the Southern Unionists and the masses.

> The penalty of a voluntary and determined participation in the rebellion should be the peremptory alienation of the estates of the conspirators, and the perpetual disenfranchisement of the conspirators themselves. . . . . The conspirators against the government of the United States should have justice meted out to them as criminals against society and the state. . . . . There can be no doubt that the leading traitors deserve to forfeit their lives for their crime. . . . . But the question is one of an enlightened and comprehensive policy for the nation. If now we strip all who have knowingly, freely and persistently upheld this rebellion, of their property and their citizenship, they will become beggared and infamous outcasts, fleeing the country . . . . like Cain, with the brand upon their foreheads, and with a punishment greater than they can bear. . . . .[105]

Dr. Thompson then spoke of winning back the "Union people of the South, and the mass of common people by kindness" but concluded "let us clear the ground of the rebellious leaders, by unrelenting confiscation and disfranchisement. . . . ."[106]

"My conciliation embraces the following programme," the Rev. Samuel T. Spear told his fashionable Presbyterian congregation in Brooklyn, "to give this rebellion *war to the knife* . . . .

[104] XXXII, No. 19, 148.

[105] *Abraham Lincoln* (New York: Loyal Publication Society, 1865), pp. 30-36.

[106] *Ibid.*

extend a generous and liberal *amnesty* to the masses of the people, upon the condition that they re-organize their State governments upon the basis of absolute loyalty, discarding traitors and abandoning slavery, holding them in the meantime subject to a military government till they resume their proper relation to the Union upon these terms . . . . divide the responsible leaders and prime authorities of the rebellion into three classes, according to the grade of their guilt."[107] These groups were:

> The first of which and the smallest—of which Jefferson Davis is a conspicuous example—I would hang by the neck till they are dead. The second class of which, and a larger class, I would expel from the country, and send them forth as fugitives over the face of the earth. The third of which, and a still larger class, I would dispossess of all political power, denying to them the right to vote, and making them ineligible to any office of profit or trust under the government of the United States. . . . .[108]

The two points in a permanent peace plan of the Rev. Henry B. Smith in his Lincoln Address were the elimination of the Southern system of caste, and the introduction of Northern schools, churches, and institutions of philanthropy.

> If we are to have a permanent peace . . . . this can be done in two ways. That caste in which the revolt was rooted, must as a caste be extirpated, partly by emancipation thoroughly carried out; partly by executing justice upon the chief authors and abettors of the crime. The other way is, by pouring all our treasures of education, philanthropy and religion into the States now impoverished and devastated by war, and uniting them to us by new and closer ties. And this is to be our greatest work. . . . . Especially must we use all means to raise up the class of freedmen to the dignity and responsibilities of their new position, as men and as citizens. . . . .[109]

The attitudes of the Northern Clergy toward war guilt and peace terms ranged from forgiveness to condemnation; in general, a pardon for the masses and for the leaders a stern sentence of death, or exile, or confiscation of property, or deprivation of citizenship. A dominant impression was that the

[107] Bishop Simpson and Others. *Our Martyr President* (New York: Tibbals and Whitney, 1865), pp. 296-98.

[108] *Ibid.*

[109] *Ibid.*, pp. 378-79.

overwhelming population of the South was deceived and duped into secession and war by a designing and selfish oligarchic leadership. Three outstanding accusations, more or less blended, were: the South was ruled by the iniquitous spirit of slavery, the South traitorously assaulted the Federal Government, and the South incited the murderous attack upon President Lincoln and his associates.

Booth was deemed a tool in the hands of a band of Southern conspirators, whose trail led to the Southern White House in Richmond. Jefferson Davis was singled out both for symbolic and personal condemnation, and in lesser measure, Robert E. Lee and other military and civil leaders were arraigned. The Southern Clergy were false prophets in the eyes of the Northern Ministers.

The Southern leaders, were designated as traitors, deserving the punishment of hanging, or exile, or loss of property and civil rights. Justice was sought in the spirit of calm deliberation, not vengeance, although the calmness seemed rather heated. The problem was ably summarized by Rev. Henry C. Badger, Congregationalist of Cambridgeport Parish, Massachusetts, who said: "To be just, but not vindictive; to punish, not for revenge, but for future security; to know when mercy is wisdom, and when it is criminal weakness—was never so desirable or so difficult as now. . . . ."[110]

[110] *The Humble Conquer* (Boston: Wm. V. Spencer, 1865), p. 16.

CHAPTER VI

The Clergy as Architects of a New South

THAT the South presented a magnificent opportunity for Christian service was a vision shared alike by many Northern Protestant clergymen. That each denomination because of its special appeal would meet a unique need in the South was also felt by prominent ministers and clerical editors. That the South urgently required religious as well as political and social reconstruction was symbolized by Northern religious leaders as an emergency call from the man of Macedonia.

The Need of Religious Reconstruction

The trumpet of a religious crusade was blown in April 1864 by the editor of the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston. A re-conditioned Christianity will be vitally needed in the rebuilding of the South. The North must make a moral conquest of the Southland.

> In the reconstruction of the South, the religious element will be of vital importance. . . . . The reorgnization of the South, on the basis of universal liberty, involves an entire revolution in the religious ideas of that section. The new Gospel must be in accordance with the spirit and teaching of Christ. In order that the work of civil regeneration shall go on thoroughly, it will be necessary to call in the aid of religion. Hence the Northern schoolmaster and minister must join in the moral conquest. . . . . As the Union armies conquer cities there will follow the prayer and class meeting and the chant of hallelujah. . . . . Why should we not occupy the ground in every Southern city as soon as our armies have subdued the rebellion? . . . . The most sacred motives which as move citizens and true Christians urge us to do our part in the great work of the religious reconstruction of the South.[1]

[1] XLIII, No. 14, 53.

In other words, the South will not be reconstructed until it accepts from Northern teacher and pastor the Christian way of life as they interpret it.

The only possible moral renovation of the South lay in the sincere and sacrificial leadership of Northern ministers, since the Southern clergy as false prophets were not fit pastors of loyal American citizens. Thus did the editor, in April of 1864, set forth his convictions in the *Christan Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago.

> We have been accustomed to observe, for years past, in our religious exchanges from the South, the evidence that just about the most radical and violent pro-slavery men, in that quarter were the ministers. . . . . To this there are noble exceptions, but they are so few that one could almost count them upon his fingers. The mass of Southern preachers are either now in the rebel army, or are holding such a course at home as, when the rebellion shall be subdued . . . . will make it in most instances impossible that they should be retained as pastors and spiritual guides of a loyal people. The result will be that nearly the whole South must become missionary ground, and the care of its religious and moral interests must devolve to a great extent, upon the churches and ministry of the North. . . . . The brethren of the North, in their ministry and in the churches, must make . . . . great efforts . . . . in behalf of those ruined communities of the South, or of seeing almost half of the whole land remain in the abomination or desolation in a moral and social point of view.[2]

A broad sociological panorama of Southern needs was surveyed in April 1865 by the editor of the *Congregationalist* of Boston. He was convinced that the South could not rebuild herself, but required aid from the entire nation. The North must provide the basis for a free and Christian civilization.

> Southern society is now in a state of disintegration. . . . . So complete is the chaos, that some sagacious observers have doubted whether the elements of social reorganization can be found in the South. Slavery has prevented the existence of an industrial middle class, and it has created an aristocracy which have no faculty for self-support, now that the war and emancipation have swept away their property and reduced them to a shiftless dependence. . . . . The radical vice of Southern society has been the plantation system, in distinction from the farm and

[2]II, No. 37, 2.

> village system of the North and West. The rebellion was instigated by the landed aristocracy in order to repress the spread of liberty and of knowledge, and the consequent increase of power, among the people. . . . . The regeneration of the South, therefore, requires this false system of political economy shall be broken up. The first step toward this must be the inexorable confiscation of the estates of the chief promoters, or supporters, of the rebellion. Next, when these lands come fairly into the market, they must be thrown open to the loyal and industrious natives of the South, who may yet suffice for the nucleus of reconstruction, and also, to the better class of emigrants from the North. . . . . For this new body of small land-owners, whose advent will change the entire social basis of the South must be provided at once schools, presses, religious agencies, and all the appliances of a civilization based upon freedom and Christianity. A work so vast as this will tax the faith, the patriotism, the philanthropy, the Christian zeal of the whole nation. . . . .[3]

Northern missionaries were vitally needed in the South to bring a pure Gospel, to introduce civilization, and to train the poor whites for Southern leadership. This ideal of social regeneration was the theme of the sermon delivered April 16, 1865, by the Rev. Alonzo Quint at the North Congregational Church of New Bedford, Massachusetts.

> Christianize that land. They need missionaries. The masses have been deceived by a corrupted Gospel. New Churches are wanted there, which will acknowledge God. They need teachers, too, and schools and civilizing processes. There is no reason to doubt the capacity of the *poor* whites to be elevated to the scale of humanity. . . . . They are not the Chivalry (planter group). You can make anything of them if you begin right and persevere. . . . .[4]

The duty of becoming the Good Samaritan was the immediate task of the North, stated the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York City in April 1865.

> It becomes us . . . . to act the part of the Good Samaritan, and to raise them up from their wretchedness. They must be fed by us. . . . . They must be clothed by us. . . . . Their schools and their schoolbooks, their reading matter and other religious provisions, must all go to them from us. . . . . It becomes, therefore, a first and para-

[3] XVII, No. 14, 54.
[4] *Southern Chivalry* (New Bedford, Mass.: Mercury Job Press, 1865), p. 44.

> mount duty with us, by all possible means to rescue the people of the South from the ruin into which they have fallen.[5]

The Methodist Chaplain H. H. Moore naturally assumed that the Federal Government and the Northern Churches would undertake social and religious work in the South, especially for the negro.

> The elevation of the black man to citizenship, intelligence, virtue and prosperity, will be an addition of just so much worth, and honor, and power to the republic. . . . . The Government proposes, not only emancipation, but paternal care and elevation. The Churches, aided by benevolent societies, and having the sympathies of the people, will bend their best energies to this work. . . . .[6]

Why should the Christian Church, the Christian minister, and the Christian layman have a direct share in the reconstruction of the South? This query was penetratingly answered by the editor of the *Christian Herald and Presbyterian Recorder* of Cincinnati in April 1865. His reply incarnates his conception of the place of religion in the war.

> It would scarcely be too much to say that the Christian sentiment of the country has grown to be the controlling element in the conduct of the war. It has been the soul of the nation's loyalty, the heart of its patriotism. It has sanctified the Union, by making it the symbol of all that is highest and holiest in the Christian aspirations of the nation. It has given to the war its high moral purpose and aim. It has put the seal of victory on our cause in securing the recognition of the negro's manhood. It has been our great national safeguard against a dishonorable peace. . . . . Indeed, most of the great principles and issues, involved in the restoration of peace, and the reconstruction of the Union, fall directly within the province of Christian truth and duty. . . . .[7]

The remains of Southern civilization must be entirely scrapped and a Northern policy of conciliation must be introduced that a new order of society supplant the Southern way of life. This dire need of the South was suggested by Dr. Joseph P. Thompson in his sermon on *Abraham Lincoln,* delivered April

[5] XL, No. 15, 116.

[6] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXXII, No. 14, 105.

[7] XXV, No. 5, 18.

30, 1865, in Broadway Tabernacle Church, the largest Manhattan Congregational institution.

> The Union people of the South, and the mass of common people, won back by kindness, uniting with our veterans and Northern emigrants, would plant farms upon the old slave plantations, and with our help in schools and churches, a new social order would arise upon the basis of freedom and loyalty, to be guaranteed by the institutions of education and religion, and by placing the ballot in the hands of every man who is known to be loyal and who can read it. . . . . There is now nothing of the old order of things we can safely build upon, or will serve as material for building. . . . .[8]

The South a field for Northern Christian service tersely revealed the ideal of the editor of the *Universalist* of Boston in April 1865. He wrote: "We must educate the people we have conquered. We must give them the schools and the church. What a sphere for the missionary. . . . ."[9]

The moral reconstruction of the South is more basic and fundamental than political rebuilding. The task of religion in this respect is more important than that of the Federal Government. The pure Northern faith is the only appropriate agent to save the impure Southern religion. This was the Christian philosophy and social ethics of the editor of the *Christian Herald and Presbyterian Recorder* of Cincinnati in his editorial of May 1865.

> Our statesmen are already busy with the grave problem of political reconstruction . . . . underneath all this lies a much broader and larger problem; their problem of *moral reconstruction* . . . . some radical change in the thoughts, convictions, sentiments and characteristics of the people of the seceding States—a change which shall make them, at heart, a better race, and thus fit them to appreciate free institutions and a higher civilization. . . . A degree of popular ignorance . . . . a measure of social degradation on the part of the white masses . . . . a disregard of law and public order, and a proverbial tendency toward violence and recklessness. . . . . And how shall the political reconstruction . . . . be effected, unless these baneful influences are removed, unless such ignorance, social degradation, lawlessness, immorality and sin be

[8](New York: Loyal Publication Society, 1865), p. 35.
[9]XLVI, No. 50, 2.

> swept away; and a worthier type of civilization, including a true humanity and a true morality, be implanted in their stead? . . . . And how shall this be done, except by sending thither the teacher and the minister, the Bible and the school book, to perform their silent and effective work; except by rearing the academy and the sanctuary. . . . . It is no false accusation to say, that the Christianity of the South has proven itself so far inferior and corrupt as to be unworthy of our confidence, and incompetent to the task of thus elevating, purifying, regenerating the masses of those who have lived under its benumbing power. We are convinced that a new, a worthier, a more vital and efficacious type of religion must be introduced —not so much to work in conjunction with this, as to supplant it and even work against it. A purer faith is to be preached. . . . . It is indispensable, even to the civil renovation of the South, that a true Gospel should be implanted there. . . . .[10]

A ringing challenge to the Northern missionary for the South was sounded by the Rev. Lyman Abbott, in later years the successor of Dr. Henry Ward Beecher at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, and the editor of the *Outlook*. In his address in May 1865 at the annual meeting of the Home Missionary Society (Congregational) he fully realized the obstacles to be surmounted but mapped out a religious campaign for the moral conquest of the South. The title of his address was "The Ministry for the South."

> Into these great cities a free Gospel must be sent. The military campaign must be followed by a religious campaign. The great strategic points of the South—Nashville, Richmond, Charleston, Savannah, New Orleans, must be occupied by churches fully in sympathy with the new order, with liberty, humanity, education, industry, and one nationality. . . . . The Northern missionary has to undo all that the Southern Clergy has been doing for half a century. He has to overcome prejudices life long, and passions bitterly inflamed by war. He has to preach loyalty where treason has been preached as a heroic virtue, liberty where slavery has been preached as an ordinance of God, and humanity where the unity of the race has been declared an infidel imagination. . . . . The rebellion still lives in the hearts of the people. . . . . The great trees of rebellion have been cut down by the sword of war. The

[10] XXV, No. 7, 26.

> stumps of treason still remain rooted in the hearts of the people. And these must be taken away before we shall obtain the fruits of a permanent peace. Thus a new battle begins, where the former ends. A battle of thoughts, ideas, of truth against falsehood, of civilization against barbarism. Lee has capitulated; but the devil has not. And in this new battle, the old ideas will have leaders of power and of genius. There will be Lees, and Johnstons, and Jacksons, in the Southern pulpits. And we must send there Grants, and Shermans, and Sheridans to wield our sword of God's truth. For the Southern clergy are neither conquered nor converted. . . . . The work of the army is over. The work of the churches just begins. . . . . The nation has conquered. The churches must redeem. . . . .[11]

A religious reconstruction of the South must be part and parcel of the total program of the social, economic, political and moral rebuilding, averred the editor of the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago in June 1865. "In the religious sense," he said,

> there is to be "reconstruction." The South, itself, is to be reconstructed—the waste and the ruin of war remedied, churches and preachers reinstated, the religious wants of the people supplied, and there is to be a reconstruction of the South in relation to the North. For a right condition of things, the union of the States will be a religious as well as a political one. . . . .[12]

The hope of a religious unity as well as a political union expressed the ideal of the editor of the *Observer* (Presbyterian) of New York City in August 1865.

> As we are one politically, so we shall be one ecclesiastically, and I hope and believe the day is not far distant when we will be re-united. But whatever be the issue, this is certain, that without aid from the brethren of the North, many churches will be deprived of a preached word, from sheer inability to support a pastor. Colleges and seminaries will remain closed for the same reason. Sabbath-school-books, religious reading, pastors and pecuniary aid are needed to carry on the work of religious instruction . . . . there was a great field for Northern energy and capital . . . . as great a field for the brethren of the church, North, to enter and cultivate.[13]

[11] *The Home Missionary* (New York), XXXVIII, No. 7, 159-60.
[12] XII, No. 43, 2.
[13] XLIII, No. 32, 254.

In the same month the editor of the *Universalist* of Boston discussed the question of reconstruction in the "light of Christian principles." He advised that "words should be avoided, that are calculated only to inflame angry passions . . . . so to speak and write as not needlessly to taunt a fallen foe—to remember the law of love in every word written, and in every measure proposed having regard to the issues involved in the reorganization of the subjugated people. . . . ."[14]

The theme of emergency relief for the Southerners was set forth by the Rev. Joseph T. Thompson (Pastor Broadway Tabernacle Congregational Church of New York City), president of the American Union Commission, at a meeting in Cooper Institute in New York, in November 1865. The commission was organized

> for the relief of refugees pouring from the South. It extended relief to 80,000 persons. It has branches in Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, Cincinnati, and elsewhere. It is proposed to extend the sphere of its operations to whole states. . . . . Will anyone say these are the people who attempted the life of the nation; let them suffer? No, my friends . . . . you would take them in. You would not even prescribe an oath before feeding them. . . . . We have no idea of patronizing the South, but to go to them as brothers. The second object of the Commission is to afford industrial and educational aid. Co-operation with the Southern people is one of our principles. . . . .[15]

In the spirit of missionary zeal, the Rev. John Milton Holmes of the Congregational Tabernacle of Jersey City, New Jersey, in December 1865 raised the question dominant in the lives of so many Northern clergymen and their parishioners:

> Where in all the world is the field whiter for the harvest than among the enfranchised population of both races at the South? How can we do a higher service for the Master than by laying the foundations of Christian Churches? . . . .[16]

Thus the Northern clergy felt that there was a dire need of religious reconstruction in the South, that they were the only religious leaders available and qualified to meet this need, and that their task of spiritual rebuilding was the structural basis

[14] XLVII, No. 5, 2.
[15] *New York Observer* (New York City), XLIII, No. 46, 366.
[16] *The Pilgrim Temple Builders* (New York: Tibbals & Whiting, 1866), p. 32.

of the total project of Southern political, economic, social, cultural, and moral recovery. These attitudes reveal the spirit of the ministers who shared them: some disciplinary, others conciliatory; some vindictive, others forbearing; some helping, others crusading. But clergymen have no twilight between right and wrong.

PLANS OF SPIRITUAL REGENERATION

For a variety of reasons Northern religious leaders became convinced that a moral crusade for the religious recovery of the South was most vital, and that they were the only leaders able and willing to launch this spiritual campaign. Out of the welter of policies and plans proposed for this task, there emerged several distinct types of procedure, put into practice more or less completely and individualistically by various denominations.

1. The Plan of Annihilation

The central idea of this plan was that the South must experience a spiritual re-birth, must transform its theology, must change its leadership, and in general must submit to the transformation of the Christian Southern way of life into a Northern Christian philosophy of life. This plan signified, virtually, plain, unvarnished, cut-throat competition. Denominational zeal and sectarian proselytism were to reign supreme.

The need of a new gospel for the South, of new theology, new sermons, and a new Christian spirit is well illustrated in the editorial position of the *Christian Register* (Unitarian) of Boston in 1865.

> . . . . the present condition of the South, to a great extent, is the result of its religious teaching, and if we gospel from what it has ever had before. . . . . She (the South) needs Beecher, Chapin, Bellows, and men who preach the religion of practical righteousness and aim to build up the church of the Divine humanity—men who believe more in Jesus than in Moses. . . . . The South is missionary ground and needs a new gospel. Its theology and preaching must be changed. . . . . The South, in order to be thoroughly regenerated, must have a religion which shall conform to the essential ideas, aims and spirit of Liberal Christianity. . . . . Here is a grand field for missionary effort. . . . .[17]

[17] XLIV, No. 5, 18.

Thus Southern Christendom must sacrifice its Trinitarian theology and become Unitarian which was probably as abhorrent to the Clergy of the South as the slavery system was to the Northern clerical leaders of Liberal Christianity.

The unique mission of Congregationalism as well as its divine, patriotic, and moral duty to move Southward, was glorified by the editor of the *Congregationalist* of Boston.

> . . . . the wisdom of that simple ecclesiastical organization which the apostles instituted is strikingly illustrated in its adaptation to the present phase of society in the South. . . . . The great territorial churches of the South have been so corrupted with the spirit of slavery and are still so tainted with sympathy for the rebellion that they are utterly unfitted for the moral work of reconstruction. . . . . Congregationalists owe it, not to their system, but to Christ and his church, to their country, and to freedom, to promote throughout the South the forming of such loyal centers of spiritual power.[18]

A policy of zeal and immediate action for Southern spiritual occupation was vigorously elaborated by the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York City, in February 1865. He asked in his editorial: "What are to be our relations to the Methodism of the late seceded but soon to be restored states?"

> They have the ground by pre-occupation. . . . . And yet we are steadily advancing among them. . . . . We are, however, decidedly inclined to agree with those who believe that our Church owes it to herself and to the people of the South to enter into and to occupy the country, and that, too: entirely independently of the pretensions of the local Methodism, which has become hopelessly debauched with pro-slaveryism, and tainted with treason . . . many northern people—many of them soldiers of the Union army, with their families—will become permanent residents of the South . . . . it is very certain that the emancipated race will not accept the services (of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South). . . . . It is quite evident, therefore, that our Church must spread its institution over all the southern states . . . . it will be compelled to sharply define its antagonism to the spurious local Methodism of the country. . . . .[19]

[18]XVII, No. 8, 30.
[19]XL, No. 6, 44.

Then, after the cessation of hostilities, the editor in May 1865, for the honor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, urged straightway the projection of a comprehensive missionary program.

> What, then, is the sum of the whole matter? and how should we as a Church proceed in the case? . . . . A policy of earnest and *antagonistic* aggression must now be adopted and put in action, or else the field must be abandoned . . . . we are convinced the less we have to do with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, or its ministers, as such, the better. . . . . A hundred ministers are called for at once to occupy the whole reclaimed territory of the South, and to offer genuine loyal Methodism to the people there who will receive it. . . . . The honor of Methodism requires this at our hands, and the interests of Christ's Kingdom demands it. . . . . How shall our Church go South? . . . . The only right and successful way is to entirely ignore the idea of color in the organization of our Churches, and conferences throughout the land.[20]

Therefore, the Plan of Annihilation sought directly and indirectly to erase Southern Christianity from the face of the earth, and to erect in its place the ideals of Northern Christianity, or to supplant the religious ideas of slavery by those spiritual ideals of freedom. The spirit and way of life of the North was to become regnant in all the Southland.

2. The Plan of Supplementation

The special feature of this plan was the independent expansion of Northern Christianity across the Mason and Dixon Line. But instead of the spirit of cut-throat competition the idea of amicable rivalry was basic, the friendly sharing of a superior Northern concept of Christianity. The goal to be achieved was the supplementation of native religious forces to meet more adequately the spiritual needs of that section which Southern Christianity could not or would not cultivate.

"The True Policy of Southern Methodism" was the subject of an editorial in the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati after the war's termination in 1865.

> It is our conviction that the Methodist Episcopal Church has a great work of occupation and evangelisation to do in the Southern states, and that she should appro-

[20] *Ibid.*, No. 21, 164.

priate her men and means without stint, for the fulfillment of this mission. There are true Union men in all parts of the South, who can never be gathered into the fold of Southern Methodism. . . . . There are thousands of colored people whom the Lord has cast upon us. The dwellers by the Northern lakes are seeking fortune and homes on the streams which flow into the Gulf of Mexico. . . . . The honest Germans are beginning to stretch out their arms to grasp the Southern shores. Many brave soldiers, who have fought with Grant and marched with Sherman . . . . are preparing to 'settle down' on the fields made memorable by their sufferings and valor. Among all these classes are the children of the Methodist Episcopal Church, whom she cannot neglect. Our Church is *needed*, therefore, in all the Southern States, for the work will daily increase in magnitude and importance, and which Southern Methodism can not perform. . . . . We have our own special and appropriate mission to accomplish. . . . . There must be, and, by the grace of God . . . . a Church without proslavery zeal and bitterness, and without any taint of disloyalty and treason. Our position is, that the only justification of a continued organization on the part of the 'Church South,' is to do work of pacification and religion which no other body can, at the present time, do so advantageously, or successfully, and with the ultimate purpose of reunion, not formally effected, but resulting, inevitably from a common aim, and from the spirit of love and Christian brotherhood. . . . .[21]

This editor on another occasion explained his idea of supplementing Southern Methodist Churches with those of the North because he felt that religion in the South would be less sectional and that we would "come to know each other better, and affiliation" would "render eventual union easier."[22]

The Rev. Joseph E. Joy, agent for the Home Missionary Society (Congregational) reported a tour of inspection of the South in the interest of extending missions in that area, which began October 11, 1865, and extended for three months in such cities as: Covington, Lexington, Frankfort, Louisville, Nashville, Chattanooga, Knoxville, Huntsville, Memphis, Helena, Vicksburg, Jackson, Natchez, New Orleans, Mobile, Montgomery, Atlanta, Augusta, Savannah, Charleston, Wilmington,

[21] XXXII, No. 34, 268.
[22] *Ibid.*, No. 19, 148.

Newbern, Goldsborough, Richmond and also Washington. He observed no signs of repentance on the part of those he met or observed. He then stated his reasons why he thought the Congregational Church should enter the South.

1. Its people are going there. . . . .
2. It is needed to round out the preaching of the Gospel. The God-ward element has been presented but the man-ward neglected. . . . .
3. As the Puritan has now triumphed over the Cavalier, he should take possession of his conquest, and that by his most vital, comprehensive system—the self-governing, Bible-reverencing Church. As the new ideas of freedom and of free institutions are now going into the South, let them be represented by that form of church order which most completely embodies them. . . . .
4. The Puritan material at the South, absorbed into the old churches, will only be neutralized. . . . .
5. Its democratic element and its broad catholicity, joined to a living faith, will satisfy a craving in many minds at the South, and set forth a higher type of Christian character. . . . .

Mr. Joy concluded with the impelling text: "Let us go up at once and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it."[23] This report is a splendid illustration of a denomination virtually not represented in the South at all, but seeking to become a supplementary branch of Christianity to make complete the interpretation of Christian truth in that territory.

Dr. Lyman Abbott heartily agreed with the sentiments of Mr. Joy, for he was sure that the South, in its rebuilding needed the "establishment of free churches, and the proclamation of a full Gospel" for heretofore "it has been easier to preach the Gospel in its fullness in Roman Catholic Italy, Mohammedan Turkey, heathen India, or barbaric Africa, than in the slave-holding States of Protestant America. . . . ."[24]

The Plan of Supplementation, while seeking to meet religious needs in the South that would be otherwise unmet, was put into effect with no consideration for the feelings or wishes or counsel of Southern Christians, and hence was not received by their white leaders with much gratitude.

[23] *The Home Missionary* (New York), XXXVIII, No. 11, 253.
[24] *Ibid.*, No. 12, 279.

3. The Plan of Co-operation

The outstanding thought of this plan was the sincere offer of Christian friendship and service, expressive of the gesture of good will and conciliation. There was to be no conquest and uninvited crusade, but rather a mutual understanding and brotherly helpfulness, Northern and Southern Christianity blending into one faith in spirit and in truth.

The editor of the *New York Observer* (Presbyterian) of New York City in an editorial shortly before Lincoln was shot, and two editorials after the assassination, beautifully expressed the Christian ideal of co-operative good will and service. The title of the first editorial was: "The End of the Rebellion," published April 13th.

> . . . . the wave of joy was also the waters of forgiveness, reconciliation and peace. No angry or revengeful feelings mingled with the glad emotions of the hour. . . . Now let us address ourselves to the great work of conciliation, restoration of good feeling, and rebuilding the ruins of war. . . . . Let us shed no more blood. Let us bind up the wounds now bleeding, care for the widow and orphan; cherish the memory of the dead; provide for the living whom it has made cripples and destitute; rebuild the churches that have been destroyed; supply the demands for bread, and for the waters of eternal life . . . efface the marks of this long and fearful strife. . . .[25]

In May, after a wave of fierce condemnation swept the religious world of the North acclaiming the murder of the President the climax and acme of Southern atrocities, this Presbyterian editor continued in the same spirit of charitableness.

> We are one again. Let us go to work to help one another. We have been at war for four years, let us now be friends, brothers, countrymen. The union of feeling must be restored. The expressions of vengeance which now and then are heard from Christian lips ought to give place to words of kindness and charity . . . . the masses of the people, the great body politic, who have been the dupes and victims and agents of these leaders, what is our duty toward them? Plainly, to cultivate as rapidly as possible the most kindly relations of business and friendship, to bind them to the Union by the double ties of interest and affection. . . . . But the South has been utterly cast

[25] XLIII, No. 15, 114.

> down. We must build it up. If help is wanted for the immediate relief of the suffering, we must send it. Instead of imposing new burdens and restrictions, we must do all we can to encourage them to develop all the resources, and to bring new crops to market. . . . . The South is now open to all the efforts of benevolence and business. . . . . We are to have no divided or antagonistic interests. . . . . We are never to quarrel again. We are under vast bonds to love and help one another. . . . .[26]

Then in December of 1865 he said:

> Imploring cries are made to us daily by ministers and others to send money, corn, clothing, etc., to the South, to relieve the poor. Calls are constantly made for aid to help feeble churches and struggling institutions. To all these appeals, we are in duty bound to respond because our brethren are suffering. . . . .[27]

Thus throughout the year of 1865, even immediately after the shot was fired by John Wilkes Booth, the *New York Observer* steadily maintained the policy of conciliation and friendship.

The ideal of co-operation was also happily expressed by the editor of the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago toward the close of 1865.

> For our own part, while we sincerely desire the religious as well as the political reconstruction of the South, we do not wish it to be the result effected from without, but from within; the work of Southern Christians, their brethren of the North co-operating in friendly alliance. . . . . Let them meet us frankly, half-way, and join with us in real and hearty endeavor to build on new foundations a new and better order of things, North and South, and they will find that Northern Baptists are ready for an alliance that shall be equally worthy of both. . . . .[28]

Unfortunately the Plan of Co-operation with Southern whites, while possibly most closely approximating the Christian ideal, was speedily crushed in the radical political reconstruction pogroms, and Northern clergymen devoted virtually their entire missionary work to the service of the negro, the underprivileged white, and the Northern emigrant. The continuing war-spirit of conquest rather than the Prince of Peace seemed

[26] XLIII, No. 21, 166.
[27] *Ibid.*, No. 48, p. 238.
[28] XIII, No. 13, 2.

to motivate many if not most of the Northern clerical architects who would rebuild the South.

Projected Programs for a New South

The plans of annihilation or supplementation or co-operation were put into effect through various types of programs of Christian service. Some of these were temporary, lasting for the duration of the war, while others were of a more permanent nature. One of the first methods of church-work in the South was:

The Occupation of White Christendom

Officials of the Methodist Episcopal, Baptist, United Brethren, Associate Reformed Presbyterian, and the New and Old School Presbyterian Churches, requested the War Department for permission to inaugurate missionary work in the South. The earliest order placing Southern churches at the disposal of Northern religionists was signed by Secretary Stanton in 1862. Military protection was to be afforded those missionaries who were to occupy the pulpits of the denominations "in which a loyal minister of said Church does not now officiate." Such work was to include teaching as well as preaching and allied activities. Although a temporary war measure this action was eagerly approved by these Northern Churches, and bitterly condemned by Southern Churches.[29]

In 1864 the Methodist Episcopal Church, North, through its Board of Missions, appropriated $35,000 for this Southern extension program, the purpose being stated in the *Christian Advocate and Journal* of New York City by Rev. R. Wheatley:

> . . . . every church organized under their auspices will become a link in that mighty chain which shall henceforth bind the different states in closer union than ever. . . . . Establish purely Methodistic and anti-slavery, that is to say, Christian Churches in the large cities and towns of the South, and they will infallibly become the nuclei of emancipation and Union Societies. . . . .[30]

The editor of the above journal realized the "delicate"

[29]W. W. Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1930), pp. 460-62.

[30]XXIX, No. 5, 33.

nature of war-time religious invasion and suggested the type of missionaries required for this service.

> . . . . the sending of missionaries by our Society to occupy those churches of the South which are either abandoned or occupied by disloyal ministers, is a movement which requires great care and prudence. We trust that choice men will be selected for the delicate errand; men of profound piety, great firmness, mature age; men who seek above all things the salvation of souls. They are not to go on a political errand. . . . . We do not ask or expect that they will preach politics, but that they will preach the Gospel. . . . . We expect them also to pray for the government, not in equivocal terms . . . . (to pray for) the President of these United States . . . .[31]

Some months later the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* reported the success of this missionary endeavor.

> Already the loyal Methodists of the South are earnestly desirous of returning to the bosom of the Methodist Episcopal Church, where they will be supplied with a loyal ministry. The result will be that the Methodist Episcopal Church will absorb the loyal Methodism of the South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, will die with the rebellion, which she, more than all others, helped to inaugurate, and the Methodist Episcopal Church will again spread over the South. Indeed, the process is already rapidly going on. Should the rebellion be entirely destroyed, there will be but one Methodist Episcopal Church in these United States. . . . .[32]

This policy, in reality, was one of occupation and extermination, the Northern Church seeking the annihilation of the Southern Church.

Replying to a fury of Southern criticism, in February 1865, the above magazine essayed to justify Southern ecclesiastical conquest.

> At almost every prominent point in the South, men of the North have gathered in for business and other purposes, and they cannot be persuaded to worship with a disloyal slavery-loving ministry and Church. Bishops, editors, prominent men everywhere, receive perpetual intercessions to send their rescue and help. . . . . A just and wise order of Secretary Stanton placed the church

[31] XXIX, No. 6, 44.
[32] XXXI, No. 16, 124.

> buildings of the rebellious Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at the disposal of certain of our bishops, upon the principle that only loyal ministers appointed by a loyal bishop, should be permitted to officiate in them. In this way, some of the edifices for so many years occupied by the Church South have been for a time used by our ministers as places of worship. . . . . But we have no idea that the Stanton order was supposed to give us titles to these forsaken sanctuaries. . . . . But it was right to silence these rebel pulpits and right to give room for a loyal Gospel, and was indeed a military necessity. Neither our head or our heart condemns this occupancy of these edifices. . . . . Yet we would not rely upon the permanent possession of this property. Most of the church edifices in the South are antiquated and inconvenient. . . . . We should forthwith obtain the most eligible situations and proceed to erect tasteful and convenient edifices thereon. Northern charity should be solicited and freely granted in these premises. At all our great centers at least noble edifices should arise to receive the adherents of old Methodism. . . . .[33]

Possibly if the church edifices had been modern, aesthetic, and well located, the editor would have been loath to abandon the temporary possession and relocate elsewhere in substantial structures.

In June 1865 an article by "G" was published in the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati, which afforded a somewhat different interpretation of the achievement of the occupation policy.

> To every loyal man in the 'Church South' who will accept the Discipline and antislavery policy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we offer a cordial welcome and a Methodist home. We can go no further. . . . . The leading wealthy Southern white Methodists are the implacable, irreconciliable enemies of our Church. . . . . But the negroes are our friends, and all the loyal elements which are now in the South, and which, like another army of conquest, are destined to appear everywhere in her sunny clime, will gather around our standard. . . . . Let us . . . . unfurl our loyal, National Methodist banner to every Southern breeze.[34]

Slowly but surely the Northern clerical missionaries were

[33] XXXII, No. 8, 60.
[34] *Ibid.*, No. 23, 177.

beginning to realize the futility of saving the intelligent white South and were increasing their interest in the black race.

There was apparently still some hope of 'Methodizing' the border states with a true label of that brand of denominationalism. In June 1865 an important missionary rally was held in the Union Methodist Episcopal Church in St. Louis, attended by the Methodist clergy and laity of the Southwest, at which gathering the following resolution was heartily adopted:

> Resolved, That the Committee prepare an appeal to loyal Methodist ministers, traveling and local, and to teachers, male and female, who are members of our Church, encouraging them to emigrate to the States of Missouri and Arkansas, and to assist us in the reconstruction of Christian civilization. . . . .[35]

A month later the Rev. A. C. George wrote concerning "The Prospect in Missouri" that

> Many Methodists from the North and East have set their faces toward Missouri, and the disloyal 'Church South' will soon be overflowed by the patriotic adherents of the 'old Church'—the one, great, glorious Methodist Episcopal Church. Her ministers, teachers, and energetic, godly members are moving in force, on her enemies works, and will quietly but effectually take possession of this goodly land.[36]

The militant tone, spirit, and language of Mr. George was shared by a large number of the Northern Clergy, not only of the Methodist Church but other Protestant groups as well. American home missions shared the spirit of the Saracen in his conquest of the Near East, however, with the sword of the spirit rather than of steel.

The editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* stated that the method of Methodistic mission work was "to ignore entirely the idea of color."[37] This procedure was explained by the Rev. Gilbert Haven.

> Methodizing the South was to ignore all distinctions of color in the membership and ministry . . . . no colored or white churches as such. . . . . The colored minister might have a largely white congregation and the white

[35] XXXI, No. 25, 193.

[36] *Ibid.*, No. 30, 234.

[37] (New York), XL, No. 21, 164.

colored. But as that would be with the consent of the Churches, no conflict or confusion could ensue. . . . .[38]

The Rev. George Taylor in June 1865 mingled realism with his Christian idealism in his article entitled: "Methodist Reconstruction." He said somewhat plaintively: "while, therefore, we do not believe any general or rapid return to the M. E. Church will be witnessed, or should be expected, in the South; yet we believe that there is a loud call for a movement of our Church southward. . . . ."[39]

Then in September of 1865 the *Christian Advocate and Journal of New York City* was compelled to admit the failure of the conquest of the substantial white Christians of the South. "Our work in the South, it is now certain, will be very largely—almost wholly, indeed—among the colored people. . . . . There is no moral unity established between the North and South, and the latter seems determined that there shall be none. . . . . We have treated them with a leniency which all the world acknowledges; we have offered them a general oblivion of the past, have fed their starving population, have done everything to restore them the blessings of good and equal government, and most of our Churches have showed a willingness to repair the mutual discords of the past, and erase their very memory by offices of kindness and help. How have these measures been met by the South? With hardly a single response of respectfulness, not to speak of magnanimity. . . . .[40]

A month later, or in October 1865, he concluded hopelessly: "The two bodies (Methodist Episcopal Church, North and South) are and must be antagonistic; yet there need be no angry contentions between them. . . . ."[41]

From 1862 to 1865, we read the story of the occupation of Southern White Christendom: its rise and fall. A somewhat detailed sketch of one denomination, undoubtedly the leading Northern Church engaged in such a crusade, is a cross section of the work of the less militant groups.

Thus the sincere but intrusive crusade of conquest and occupation of White Christendom failed in spite of all the kind deeds of emergency relief, and attempts to remold the Southern Way of life.

[38](New York), XL, No. 22, 169.
[39]*Ibid.*, No. 23, 177.
[40]*Ibid.*, No. 36, 284.
[41]*Ibid.*, No. 40, 316.

A FIELD FOR NEGRO MISSIONS

It was natural that the Freedman would make a dramatic appeal to the clerical leaders of religion, benevolence, and philanthropy. He had been the concern of Quakers from colonial days, of anti-slavery folks during the first few decades of the republic, and of the abolitionists of Massachusetts and Ohio in the several pre-war decades.

In 1863 in the very heart of the war, the *Western Christian Advocate* of Cincinnati called attention to the fact that the "present condition, and the future prospects of the colored population of the South, are subjects for the grave consideration of the Christian philanthropist." Then with a comprehensive realization of the problems involved in the civilizing and Christianizing of the negro, the writer continued:

> After the immediate physical wants of these poor creatures are supplied, they need help to rise out of their condition of ignorance and moral darkness and degradation. Many of them, especially the field hands,—and these constitute the great bulk of the slaves of both sexes—have been brought up like cattle, have no proper idea of marriage, nor of the duties, civil or religious, beyond a very few elementary principles. They have almost no idea of chastity, but crude views of honesty, having been made thieves, liars and adulterers, by the system which has reduced them to bondage. There are exceptions to this state of things; but what we have stated is the rule, and it is brought forward by these advocates of perpetual bondage as the strong reason why these negroes are unfit for freedom. The physical nature of the negro is all that is developed by the condition of slavery. The mental and moral conditions of the vast majority of the slaves is that of childhood under the most corrupting influences. Ignorance and vice describe their conditions. They need everything that elevates humanity.[42]

Education and intelligence, as well as morals and character, were the supreme needs of negro missions according to this Methodist journal.

In the spirit of philosophic idealism the Rev. A. C. George spoke a word for negro missions after the close of the war.

> We can, and ought always to demand that justice be done to the negro. . . . . A gentleman is entitled to his

[42]XXX, No. 48, 380.

> rights and privileges irrespective of color. . . . . It is, therefore, a vital interest of democracy and religion that he be educated, enfranchised, and Christianized. If we increase his wealth, intelligence, and power, we increase, by just so much, the wealth, intelligence, and power of the republic. . . . . Require intelligence or a property qualification of the black man, if that is wisest and best, but require the same of every man who offers a ballot. Now is the time to decree justice and establish peace. . . . . The Church has a great duty to do . . . . the establishment of schools in which to train, for the colored people, ministers of their own race . . . . employed colored young men for missionaries in the South. . . . .[43]

The Baptists above all other Northern Christian denominations had a unique interest in the negroes, according to the opinion of the editor of the *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago.

> . . . . there is a work in the South that seems to call for the utmost efforts . . . . the freed blacks . . . . are not only now thoroughly accessible . . . . but they are in a very special manner thrown upon us as a denomination. It is well known that the blacks are to a very great extent Baptists . . . . while the freed blacks are more or less distrustful of the ministers of other denominations, they receive with open arms those of our own. . . . .[44]

Chaplain H. H. Moore, who served at the Southern front, set forth his observations concerning the colored race in a thoughtful article on "The Freedman" for the *Western Christian Advocate*. He pronounced a severe judgment upon those who did not think through the issues involved in the solution of the negro problem after the war.

> The power and influence which have effected their emancipation have assumed the responsibility of making them a respectable and homogeneous element of the American social and political fabric, and in the remolding and adjusting of this element we have no use for theorists and visionary enthusiasts. . . . . To say the negro is a man, and we have only to strike off his fetters and give him a chance and he will act an honorable part, as many do and will say, implies an utter ignorance or forgetfulness of the effects which slavery has had upon his mental and moral nature. . . . . The idea of turning the colored

[43] XXXII, No. 49, 385.
[44] XI, No. 48, 2.

> population of the South out upon the commons should not be thought of for a moment. The adults of this generation will need kind and mild, but authoritative supervision, for years to come.[45]

The Rev. Henry L. Edwards, preaching a Fast Day sermon in the Congregational Church of South Abingdon, Massachusetts, in June 1865, shared with his congregation some typical New England post-war advice treating negro rights.

> And let us give, moreover, the long degraded negro his due. Give him the Bible, and the ballot, as well as the bullet. If he has used the one as well as we, he will the other. . . . . Qualify the freedman to read, and write, and vote, as soon as possible, and let him make the most of himself that he can. . . . .[46]

The *Independent* of New York City, probably the leading "interdenominational" religious magazine of the United States, added its word of idealism which coincided in essence with the New England view.

> The debt which the people of North owe to the disinthralled is one which centuries could never repay. . . . It concerns directly the welfare of the nation that they be purified of the vices of slavery, encouraged to self-respect and self-support, and lifted to the highest level of manhood of which any of us aspire to. . . . .[47]

But the blessings of Christian evangelism in the salvation of the soul of the negro were virtually eclipsed by the demand of the Northern preachers for the political and social redemption of that race. In fact, in the order of highest importance, the right of suffrage appeared to outweigh even the privileges of education and religion, of schools and churches.

The Southern aristocrat and the Northern foreign non-Protestant must be put in their place politically by a coalition of Northern Protestants and negroes, according to the political balance of power suggested by an Ohio Methodist editor. He wrote:

> Shall a class of loyal men be perpetually degraded and disfranchised on account of color? . . . . The men who have shed their blood for the Republic, in its hour of peril, have earned for themselves and their race, equality be-

[45] XXXII, No. 14, 105.
[46] *Discourse* (So. Abingdon, Mass.: Wright & Potter, 1865), p. 16.
[47] XVI, No. 837, 4.

> fore the law, and all the rights of citizenship. And many who are not able to discern what justice demands, will see, nevertheless though slowly, what is essential to safety, and will put the ballot in the hands of the negro, to guard the Republic against the twofold danger of an aristocratic class in the South, and an Irish Catholic preponderance in the North.[48]

The Rev. A. H. Quint, well known war commentator, chaplain, and Congregational minister, in his sermon in the North Church of New Bedford, Massachusetts, waxed eloquent in his demands for negro suffrage. He attained his climax with these words: "Let the bondmen have their rights. . . . . Make all these loyal men voters. . . . . Put power in their hands. . . . . Make them governors, judges, generals. . . . "[49]

The Boston editor of the *Universalist* desired that the colored race be granted the ballot "in the process of reconstruction" for the following reasons: "the loyalty of the negro; his native born attachment to the land; his warm religious feelings, strictly and unequivocably Protestant; his industrious habits. . . . ."[50] Possibly the colored Protestant bias tended to make the franchise safe in their hands.

The *Christian Times and Illinois Baptist* of Chicago was in cordial sympathy with eastern convictions concerning negro suffrage. "The colored man has proved his manhood in the bloody field: let his manhood be recognized in the fundamental law of the law he has helped to save. . . . ."[51]

Dr. Henry Ward Beecher, pulpiteer, lecturer, orator, editor, and unofficial "diplomat," two days after delivering his Flag Raising Address at Fort Sumter, preached a sermon on *Christian Waiting* in the Zion Church (African) in Charleston, South Carolina. It was a dramatic setting, scene, and sermon. Here met two national symbols of the decade and a half of sectional turbulence: the Northern preacher and anti-slavery exponent; and the slave and freedman. They met in a Christian Church, for some a den of sectional discord and hatred; for others a shrine of freedom and brotherly love. Speaking as a father to children he said:

[48] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXXII, No. 12, 92.
[49] *Southern Chivalry* (New Bedford, Mass.: Mercury Job Press, 1865), p. 44.
[50] XLVII, No. 3, 2.
[51] XII, No. 40, 3.

> I have a word for my colored friends that are present. You certainly have learned to wait. . . . . Your most dangerous enemies are like serpents in the grass. Among them are vanity, pride, impertinence, indolence, carelessness, dishonesty, and complainings. . . . . You have waited long, and what has God brought you? Your liberty! Take this boon and make good use of it. Let men see that you can be free without being destroyed. . . . . And, by-and-by, when the vote is put into your hand, make as good use of that as you now do of the musket. . . . . Remember that you must creep before you walk. Do not be impatient. Live in hope. Things will come out right—if not to-day, then to-morrow. Evils will steadily correct themselves. Give the government time. Give our public men time. . . . . Now the South lies wallowing on the ground. The devil, of which she has been possessed, has rent her sore and cast her on the ground. . . . . And ere long she shall wake, and rise to a better manhood than she has ever attained. There was never before such a good time for the South as there is to-day. I would rather have her in her laceration, and poverty, and bereavement, as she is to-day, than to have her as she was in the palmy days of wealth, when every port was a mart for slaves, when every plantation was a place of bondage, and when every man was making money treading God's image under foot, and violating every canon of humanity. She is richer to-day than she ever was before, because she has got rid of the incarnate fiend of which she was possessed. . . . . But consider that great work which has been brought upon us by the events of our time—the work of educating and caring for the colored men of the South. . . . . There never has been a period in my lifetime when I could go south of Mason and Dixon's line except at risk of my life. . . . . But things are changed; and I am here in Charleston! . . . .[52]

The Christian home missionary work of the Northern Churches was dominantly devoted to the elevation of the colored race after the tactless conquest of Southern white Christianity. Whether the Northern Clergy tended to prepare the way for the political carpet-baggers and scalawags, whether these Northern missionaries co-operated with these political scamps, and whether the Northern religious crusaders were in themselves spiritual carpet-baggers and scalawags, we are not pre-

[52] *Sermons* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1868), pp. 24-29; 31.

pared to evaluate. At least the evidence suggests a clerico-political relationship.

Work Among the "Poor Whites"

The religious leaders of the North invariably carefully distinguished between the aristocratic planter, the merchant, the professional man, the whites of wealth or position or education; and the underprivileged whites, or poor whites, and the "white trash." These latter more or less poverty-stricken folks were deemed objects of Christian redemption and especially the "poor white" as the coming leader of the New South.

"The Poor Whites" was the title of an article in the *Congregationalist* of Boston which discussed the needs of that group. The writer averred that their number

> must be nearly four millions. . . . . Some of them hold considerable land, and are well supplied with the absolute necessities of life. But they are emphatically poor. Below the poor whites, there is still a lower depth—the mean whites . . . . a school for poor whites is a thing unknown. . . . . How shall we reach this people with the Bible and the spelling book? . . . . these home heathens. . . . . Our Home Missions must at once enlarge. Our foreign field sinks into comparative insignificance compared with our work within our own bounds. Every church in our land should enlarge its Home Mission Charities, even if others fall off.[53]

This suggestion that the Peter of Foreign Missions be "robbed" to pay the Paul of Southern Missions implied the belief that the overseas "heathen" who had never heard of Christ, were in a superior spiritual condition to the Southern "Poor Whites." Save the Southern Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and the like, and let the Hindus, Mohammedans, Buddhists, Confucionists, and South Sea Islanders go neglected, at least for a time. Southern Americans who understood this Northern judicial attitude of the Clergy were not highly complimented or pleased, to say the least.

An article treating the "Poor Whites" by "Quintus" (The Rev. A. H. Quint, Congregationalist) was published in the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati. These

[53] XVII, No. 38, 149.

were the men he was assured would be the future leaders of the South, because of their honesty and patriotism.

> These are the men we must use in the means of reorganizing the institutions of the South. . . . . We must give them the means to become the ruling class of the South. . . . . immediate succor in the want and distress; furnish them schools, and aid them in building churches, and maintaining religious worship. They need above all things at present, a healthy and honest religious and political literature. . . . .[54]

"Quintus" was exceedingly discriminating in his rigid separation of the "Poor Whites" from the "White Trash," in his discussion.

The literary cleric who presided over the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (Methodist) of New York City, discussed the theme: "Social Disintegration in the South." The prospect of future Southern leadership by the planter, former slaveholding group, was "utterly hopeless;" for the middle class whites, mechanics, and small farmers, the prospects were "better;" the "poor whites" will also feel social "convulsions;" the middle class of whites "lack self-reliance and manly assertion of men" because they have lacked the institutions of freedom and have been dominated by the planter oligarchy.[55] He concluded with an impassioned plea:

> Christians, countrymen, never before was such a mission given to any people. It must be our great business through the years of the immediate future to reconstruct southern society on the basis of free labor, and universal education, in the absence of class-legislation, and with all men, as of a common brotherhood, equal before the law.[56]

The *Christian Times and Witness* of Chicago stated its position with reference to the "poor whites" in a series of problem questions. The South must be regenerated, must abolish the "poor white" class, and must "raise all classes alike."[57]

The Rev. Lyman Abbott, Secretary of the American Union (Freedmen's) Commission, felt that Northern Christianity should provide the "poor whites" with "free schools and a full Gospel."[58]

[54] XXXI, No. 18, 138.
[55] XL, No. 14, 108.
[56] *Ibid.*
[57] XIII, No. 1, 3.
[58] *The Home Missionary* (New York), XXXVII, No. 12, 279.

Work among the underprivileged whites became a Northern missionary interest second only to that of the negro, conducted primarily by Northern Christian workers in the realm of education, and in a minor manner through the subsidy or missionary aid to struggling churches.

Northern Churches for Northern Emigrants

Many are the references to a large prospective emigration Southward, after the war, these various emigrants to provide an important factor in the economic, social and moral rebuilding of the section, and especially in the realm of religion to co-operate with loyal Southerners (Unionists) in the spiritual reconstruction of the South.

A Methodist editor of the middle west enumerated the types of emigrants who would be on the march southward after conditions were settled. He suggested: Northern soldiers, Germans, business-men, promoters seeking their fortunes and the upper classes desirous of winter homes. Church homes for such emigrants would be sorely needed.[59]

A leading exponent of Congregational home missions, Dr. Lyman Abbott, in his article on "Southern Evangelization," was confident that "Northern immigrants and foreign immigrants" would flock to the South, making inevitable the planting of Northern Churches in the South.[60]

But this idea of a gargantuan movement of population was confined not only to the era of the close of the war. It gained currency even in the early part of the conflict, for as early as 1862 the editor of the *Congregationalist* of Boston assumed the mantle of the prophet when he declared that the South after the war would be "immediately colonized largely from the North and West" and that the effect on "Christ's kingdom" would be "glorious," for "new towns" would demand and receive the Gospel all over the South and Southwest.

While the trek southward did not assume colossal proportions, thin lines of Northern white churches were planted, in that section, chiefly in the cities.

[59] *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXXIV, No. 34, 268.
[60] *The Home Missionary* (New York), XXXVII, No. 12, 279.

NORTHERN PROPHETS OF IDEALISM AND REALISM

What was to be the outcome of Civil War and Reconstruction? What was, and would be, the continuing reaction and response of the South toward defeat and rebuilding? Would the United States become a political, economic, social, and religious unit or would sectionalism continue? What, then, were the "victory attitudes" of the Northern Clergy toward the South? What did the Northern Ministers think the Southern feelings were? Finally, what were the Northern clerical opinions of Southern defeatist reactions? Southern, Northern, and national reconstruction would very largely be based upon the mutual sectional attitudes, policies, and programs. Some Northern Ministers held their heads in the mists of visions, others kept their feet in the mud of swamps, while still others walked on dry ground with their minds in the skies of hope. Northern prophets were visionary or idealistic or pragmatic or pessimistic. They were a factor in slavery-strife, war, and peace. They must share the responsibility of life in the fifties and sixties.

In the spirit of a true rather than a false prophet, Dr. E. O. Haven, editor of *Zion's Herald* (Methodist) of Boston as early as 1862 realized the colossal difficulty of restoring national harmony.

> We do not look for a speedy reconciliation with the rebel States. . . . . Our children will have other burdens to bear than their portion of the expense of this war. . . . . The evils of slavery will entail a long series of trying duties and heavy burdens upon the nation. It has ever been our fear, and will long be our weakness. There is to be a great social revolution in the North and South.[61]

The Rev. I. C. Knowlton, of the Fourth Universalist Church of Boston, preached a 100 per cent idealistic sermon on April 7, 1864, on "The Future of Our Country." A patriotic faith and a spiritual patriotism surged to the surface when he attained his homiletic climax:

> We shall be a united people. . . . . As soon as the war ceases, the North and South will flow together as did the waters of the Red Sea after the Israelites had passed. . . . Our language, relationship, contiguity, and self-interests will permit no lasting separation.[62]

[61]Quoted by *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), XXIX, No. 43, 337.
[62]*Trumpet and Christian Freeman* (Boston), XLVI, No. 1, 1.

The post bellum *National Regeneration* was painted in terms of architectural glory by the Rev. T. M. Post in his address at Washington University, St. Louis, late in 1864. The address was first published in the *Missouri Republican* and later reprinted in booklet form.

> Let us build them more than Pyramid, or Mausoleum, or Westminster—a temple of Living Liberty, overarching a continent where the spirits of the true, the loved, the gifted, the brave, may come back and walk with the memories of holy and heroic souls of all time, and with the genius of American liberty through the ages. So it best fits. Be this great Continental Republic their monument as it is their grave; their temple, where the battle-hymn of heroes, and the sweet psalm of the Saints shall mingle with the clank of no chain, the sigh of the slave. Let us build for eternal time. . . . .[63]

There were others in 1865 who did not share this idealism of 1864. The editorial: "Reconstruction and Its Dangers" in the *Christian Herald and Presbyterian Recorder* (Cincinnati) of April 27, 1865, presented a gloomy picture.

> The Southern leaders may stack their arms, but they will not stack their principles. They may give up names; they will not, if they can help it, give up things. With their accustomed arrogance, we see them even now, in the hour of their defeat, undertaking to dictate their own terms of submission, couching the most dangerous assumptions in the very articles of their capitulation. Foiled in one attempt they will make another. Compelled to acknowledge the failure of open disunion they will try to make the Union into which they reluctantly return, merely nominal. Constrained to acquiesce in the supremacy of the federal Government, they will seek as much as possible, to escape its restraints, and control. Forced to submit to the formal emancipation of their slaves, they will strive to perpetuate a political and social condition, which by grinding down the race of freedmen, and will take away the value of liberty, and furnish a pretext, if not for remanding them to bondage, at least for withholding from them the recognition of their manhood.[64]

In Boston in May 1865 the editor of the *Trumpet and Christian Freeman*, a Universalist Magazine, also distrusted most Southerners. He wrote: "The preponderance of the Southern

[63] *National Regeneration* (St. Louis: Geo. Knapp, 1864), p. 16.
[64] XXV, No. 5, 18.

population will be, for the term of a generation, hostile to the Union. . . . . With mental reservation, these men will take the oath of allegiance. . . . ."[65]

The *Independent* of New York City in August 1865 published a frank, blunt, scorching editorial on the subject, "The Unsubdued Rebellion." The re-vitalization of the tone of the South from humiliation to defiance was first noted.

> The humiliating tone of Southern society, whether political or religious, with which they recognized, a few months ago, their state as conquered, and their fate as victims, is fast passing away. . . . . The churches that of late seemed lifeless and dissolved into their original dust appear compact, organized, defiant. The field which Northern councils and synods looked upon as void and ready for their spiritual occupation is seen to be teeming with Satanic life. The rebellion is yet unsubdued. . . . . Slavery is gone, but the barbarism it engendered and that engendered it . . . . is yet filling their hearts with hate and their mouths with blasphemy. . . . ."[66]

Then a two-fold duty for the United States was advised: a task for the Government and a task for Northern Churches.

> First, we must as citizens, wage a ceaseless warfare against any recognition of these states in their rebellious attitude. These venomous masters should be put under tutors and governors till the time appointed. A freedman's bureau is less needed than a rebel's bureau. It is the white more than the black that should be cared for. The Government must appoint military governors, and grant negro suffrage. . . . ."[67]
>
> But no less is the task of the church . . . . the only law under which the loyal church can enter that territory, that of no distinction of color in her ministry or membership. We should also consider the forces arrayed against this divine idea, and the battle that must be waged for Christ, and his church, over all that soil. . . . ."[68]

The editor expected both hate and open war from the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist Churches of the South. The Northern Christian attack was to be by love and by spiritual weapons.

[65] XLVII, No. 2, 1.
[66] XVII, No. 871, 4.
[67] *Ibid.*
[68] *Ibid.*

> The churches of the North must work entirely independent of these unregenerate and apostate bodies. They must plant their missions in every center. They must push them into every outer hamlet; they must organize schools where no barrier of color shall cast its hideous shadow; they must found seminaries where the poor and despised youth of both sexes and colors shall have the opportunities such as they have never enjoyed for education and elevation. They must establish colleges where equal impartiality of color shall prevail. First of all, next to the preaching of the Word, must they start the newspaper. . . . . We must push the battle to their gates, nay within their gates. We must be as valiant for truth as they are for error. . . . . Thus and thus only shall we regenerate that portion of our country. . . . . The greater war is before us. The shackles have fallen from the slaves—they hang heavily upon his master; rebellion is expelled from the state—it hides itself in the church. From her altars it must be dragged and utterly and eternally destroyed. . . . . Let us not despair of the South. We have four millions of allies at the start. We have other four millions of poor and despised whites, whom we can win to our schools and altars by liberality, labor, and love. Let the work go forward. Push men and money into all that region. Let colonies go as they went into Kansas. Let capital go. Let the Church go as one grand army, under the pure and impartial banner of the Cross, led by its divine Commander.[69]

Whatever the motive and spirit of this editorial, it naturally played right into radical political and clerical hands, creating disunity and discord in the "birth of the nation."

"The Considerations of Restored Union" was the pulpit topic of Dr. Henry Ward Beecher, at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, October 29, 1865. President Andrew Johnson had served as the national executive for six months, and the questions of the hour were the restoration and reconstruction of the Southern States.

> Now that war has ceased from out of our midst, nothing better can crown its victories, than a generous and trustful spirit on the part of the citizens of this nation toward those who have been in error. . . . . For my own part, I think it to be the great need of this nation to save the self-respect of the South. . . . . It is desirable, on every account, that the South should be restored at the earliest practicable moment to a participation in our

[69] XVII, No. 871, 4.

> common government. It is best for us; it is best for them. . . . . Of all the men that have occupied the presidential chair, not one, it seems to me, has displayed more wisdom in the practical questions when brought before him, than has President Johnson thus far; and I am willing to trust him for the rest. . . . . I thank God for the eminent services and auspicious wisdom of Mr. Johnson. . . . .[70]

But other forces intervened!

That the post-war heritage of the South would ever be remorse and shame, was the thought conveyed in the sermon: *On National Thanksgiving for Peace* by Rev. S. G. Buckingham at the union service of the South Congregational Church of Springfield, Massachusetts, December 7, 1865. Phrasing his words most dramatically he preached:

> No descendant of those who were engaged in this rebellion can ever travel in his native State, or sail down his own rivers and bays, or visit any of our northern capitols, or go up to the national capitol, or enter a gallery of art, or take up a volume of history, or poetry, or fiction, without coming upon battle-fields, trophies, and paintings, and statues, and the verdict of history and the sentiment of mankind, and the world's admiration at our triumph over this accursed conspiracy, and its inspiring cause. If this punishment is not terrible and eternal, we know not what could be. The truth is, none could endure it, and must either flee from such a curse, if there be any wilderness where it would not reach him, or admit the justice of it, and disown all approval of the crime. . . . .[71]

But the glory of the Lost Cause prevailed!

Mingling economic and political realism with Christian idealism, the editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of Cincinnati, December 27, 1865, envisioned a glorious united nation.

> In freeing the blacks, we have freed the whites. When the troubles of transition have passed, and the laws of labor become established, a new prosperity is to dawn upon the South. Industry, enterprise, and virtue are to give to it wealth and importance as never before. As a part of this glorious land every Northerner will rejoice in her rising glory. The North is no longer to be a seething

[70] *Patriotic Addresses*, ed. John R. Howard (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1887), pp. 714-27.
[71] (Springfield, Mass.: Samuel Bowles, 1866), pp. 10-11.

caldron. The agitations of the last quarter of a century are hushed forever. Our assemblies, ecclesiastical, social, and even political are to be put on a better phase. A new, peaceful, blessed history opens before us."[73]

And then came reconstruction with a vengeance!

[73] XXXII, No. 52, 412.

Conclusions

FROM 1850 to 1865 the Northern Clergy were an outstanding articulate force in the public life of the United States. The central issue confronting the Northern Clergyman was his attitude toward negro slavery: involving the relationship of the pulpit and politics, the Christian message and social issues, the Church and the Federal Government, Christianity and War, religious loyalty and national patriotism, and the policies of religion in the rebuilding of the nation.

Many Pastors related their Christian philosophy of life to the political, social, and economic problems of the hour; sharing convictions with their public concerning the Fugitive Slave Act, Uncle Tom's Cabin, Brooks' attack upon Sumner, the Underground Railroad, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the Dred Scott Decision, John Brown at Harper's Ferry, Secession, War, Emancipation, Propaganda Overseas, War Guilt and Peace Terms, and Southern Reconstruction.

Other Ministers refrained from entering the arena of the secular, and remained aloof from the concern of this world, concentrating their efforts upon the claims of a future life, and sustaining those in their preparation for immortality.

Some Preachers opposed the strife and conflict of this decade and a half to preserve the unity of their denomination, or to proclaim the ideals of the Prince of Peace at variance with the God of Mars, or to avoid offending Southern friends, or to assert their preference for the Southern way of life.

Northern religious leaders differed widely in their attitudes toward the South. Some were bitterly hostile, others constructively critical, and still others indifferent. The punishment suggested ranged from a wholesale condemnation with extreme penalties to a general tolerance and forgiveness.

Probably the Northern Clergy were neither conservatives nor radicals in their social position and in their attitudes toward the South for any length of time, but were rather in-the-middle-of-the-road-position, swinging momentarily to the right or to the left as events became intensely emotionalized. Possibly the periods of tensest feeling were at the time of the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the firing on Fort Sumter, and the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. It was during those situations that the South was held in greatest disdain.

That a large number of prominent urban and town ministers were outspoken in their support of the Federal Government and the American Constitution, and in their condemnation of slavery, secession, and the Confederacy is obvious. That these leaders influenced both their less conspicuous and less powerful clerical brethren as well as their congregations is most likely. That the Northern Clergy profoundly molded the ideas and ideals of their parishes is apparent through the many sermons printed by request, the appreciation of the services of worship as recorded in the secular press, and the exceedingly rare condemnation of homiletic efforts. War-pressure undoubtedly silenced some opponents.

The Northern Clergy were not a unit in thought or attitude or action in their consideration of the various issues, problems, and questions that confronted the United States in the social crisis of the fifties and the military conflict of the sixties. But, by and large, those opposed to slavery, to secession, to the Confederacy, and to easy terms of reconstruction were the largest single number, possibly a majority.

Emotions were at white-heat many times during the social crisis and war-time, and the Clergy was the largest single group in the nation whose task it was to move mightily those feelings of their congregations. Their position and task were haloed by the power of religious tradition, by prayer, by hymn, by Holy Writ, by the persuasive implication of "Thus saith the Lord"—creating a holy crusade, a moral adventure, a blending of Christian and national loyalty, of sacred consecration and civic dedication, and in turn a condemnation of the enemy and of his way of life—as subversive of government, law, order, civilization, religion.

In the main, the Northern Clergy sustained the Federal Government in the winning of the war. They were the leaders of the nation's morale, chaplains at the front, inspirers in the pulpit, comforters in the home of bereavement—ever seeking to infuse the spirit of struggle, of endurance, of victory. Sunday after Sunday for fifteen years the Clergy dealt in ideas, ideals, principles, morals, action. According to their interpretation of Christian philosophy, the Clergy sought to make regnant in the South the Northern way of life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources

A. Manuscript Sermons

Goodwin, Henry M. "On the Assassination of President Lincoln." The Chicago Theological Seminary. No. 393, pp. 11-12. No. 395, pp. 17-18.

B. Sermons, Addresses, Tracts, Reminiscences

Abbott, Lyman. *Reminiscences.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1915.

Adams, Nehemiah. *A South-Side View of Slavery.* Boston: T. R. Marvin, 1855.

Allen, Jos. Henry. *A Reign of Terror.* Bangor, Maine: Samuel S. Smith, 1857.

Atwood, E. S. *The Nation's Loss.* Salem, Massachusetts: *Salem Gazette,* 1865.

Bacon, Leonard. *Two Sermons.* New Haven: Thos. H. Pease, 1857.

Badger, Henry S. *The Humble Conquer.* Boston: Wm. V. Spencer, 1865.

Barrows, Wm. *Our War and Our Religion and Their Harmony.* Boston: J. M. Whittemore, 1862.

Bartholomew, J. G. *The Hour of Peril.* Boston: Abel Tompkins, 1861.

Beecher, Henry Ward. *Freedom and War.* Boston: Tricknor and Fields, 1863.

————. *Sermons.* 2 vols. New York: Harper and Bros., 1868.

————. *Patriotic Addresses.* Edited by J. R. Howard. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1887.

Bingham, Jos. F. *National Disappointment.* Buffalo: Breed, Butler, 1865.

Blackburn, Wm. *The Crime Against the Presidency.* Trenton: Murphy and Bechtel, 1865.

Boardman, George Dana. *Re-establishment of the National Flag at Fort Sumter, April 14, 1865.* Philadelphia: Sherman and Co., 1865.

————. *Addresses.* Philadelphia: Sherman and Co., 1865.

Booth, Robert Russell. *Personal Forgiveness and Public Justice.* New York: A. D. F. Randolph, 1865.

Brantley, William T. *Our National Troubles.* Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson and Brothers, 1860.

Brooks, A. L. *An Appeal for the Right.* Chicago: *Daily Democrat Press,* 1856.

Brooks, Phillips. *Our Mercies of Re-Occupation.* Philadelphia: W. S. and Alfred Martin, 1863.

————. *The Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln.* Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead, 1865.

Buckingham, S. G. *On National Thanksgiving for Peace.* Springfield, Massachusetts: Samuel Bowles, 1866.

Bushnell, Horace. *The Northern Iron.* Hartford: Edwin Hunt and Son, 1854.

————. *Reverses Needed.* Hartford: L. E. Hunt, 1861.

Butler, C. M. *Funeral Addresses on the Death of Abraham Lincoln.* Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead, 1865.

Butler, Henry E. *God's Way of Leading the Blind.* Burlington, New York: Free Press and Book and Job Printing Office, 1865.

Butler, J. G. *The Martyr President.* Washington: McGill and Witherow, 1865.

Cheever, Henry T. *A Tract for the Times.* New York: John A. Gray, Printer, 1859.

Chester, John. *The Lesson of the Hour: Justice as well as Mercy.* Washington: Chronicle Print, 1865.

Crane, C. B. *Sermon on the Occasion of the Death of President Lincoln.* Hartford: Case, Lockwood and Co., 1865.

Cudworth, Warren H. *On the Life, Character and Public Services of the Late President Abraham Lincoln.* Boston: Wright and Potter, 1865.

Daggett, O. E. *A Sermon on the Death of Abraham Lincoln.* Canandaigua, New York: N. J. Milliken, 1865.

Day, P. B. *Discourse.* Concord: McFarland and Jenks, 1865.

De Costa, B. F. *A Discourse.* Charlestown, Massachusetts, 1862.

Dean, Sidney. *Eulogy on the Occasion of the Burial of Abraham Lincoln.* Providence: H. H. Thomas and Co., 1865.

Dwight, William T. *The Pulpit and Its Relations to Politics.* Portland, Maine: Francis Blake, 1857.

Eddy, Daniel C. *Secession, a National Crime.* Philadelphia. American Baptist Publication Society, 1863.

————. *The Martyr President.* Boston: Graves and Young, 1865.

Eddy, Richard. *Three Sermons.* Philadelphia: H. G. Leisenring, 1865.

Edwards, Henry L. *Discourse Commemorative of our Illustrious Martyr.* Boston: Wright and Potter, 1865.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *The Works of: Miscellanies.* Fireside Edition. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1878.

Ewer, F. C. *The National Crisis.* New York: Geo. F. Nesbitt, 1861.

Foster, Eden B. *Two Discourses.* Lowell: J. J. Judkins, 1854.

Foster, Edwin B. *The Constitution Our Ark in the Storm.* Springfield: Samuel Bowles, 1862.

Fransioli, Joseph. *Patriotism a Christian Virtue.* New York: Loyal Publication Society, 1863.

Fulton, Justin R. *Radicalism.* Boston: J. E. Tilton, 1865.

Gannett, Ezra S. *Relation of the North to Slavery.* Boston: Crosby, Nichols, 1854.

Gaylord, William L. *The Soldier God's Minister.* Fitchburg: Rollstone Job Printing, 1862.

Gladden, Washington. *Recollections.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1909.

Gurley, P. G. *The Voice of the Rod.* Washington: Wm. Ballantyne, 1865.

Hall, Nathaniel. *The Limits of Civil Obedience.* Boston: Wm. Crosby and H. P. Nichols, 1851.

————. *Righteousness and the Pulpit.* Boston: Wm. Crosby and H. P. Nichols, 1855.

————. *Truth not to be Overthrown nor Silenced.* Boston: John Wilson and Son, 1861.

————. *The Moral Significance of the Contrasts Between Slavery and Freedom.* Boston: Walker, Wise, 1864.

Haven, Gilbert. *A Memorial Discourse on the Character and Career of Abraham Lincoln.* Boston: James Magee, 1865.

Holmes, John Milton. *The Pilgrim Temple Builders.* New York: Tibbals and Whiting, 1866.

Hopkins, John Henry. *View of Slavery.* New York: W. I. Pooley, 1864.

Howlett, T. R. *A Discourse on the Day of Humiliation and Prayer.* Washington: Gibson Bros., 1865.

Johnston, E. S. *Abraham Lincoln.* Harrisburg: Theo. F. Sheffer, 1865.

Laurie, Thomas. *Three Discourses.* Dedham: John Cox, Jr., 1865.

Lord, Willis. *Our National Sins.* Chicago: F. A. Pierce, 1864.

Lowe, Charles. *Death of President Lincoln.* Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1865.

Paddock, Wilbur. *A Great Man Fallen.* Philadelphia: Sherman and Co., 1865.

Parke, N. G. *The Assassination of the President of the United States, Overruled for the Good of our Country.* Pittston, Pennsylvania: Gazette Office, 1865.

Parker, Theodore. *The State of the Nation.* Boston: Wm. Crosby and H. P. Nichols, 1851.

———. *The Slave Power.* (Listing Sermons and Addresses of 1848, 1850, and 1852.) Boston: American Unitarian Association, Undated.

———. *Dangers Which Threaten the Rights of Man.* Boston: B. B. Mussey, 1854.

———. *The Dangers from Slavery.* Old South Leaflets. No. 80. Boston: Old South Meeting House, Undated.

Patton, A. S. *An Occasional Discourse.* Utica: Curtiss and White, 1865.

Perkins, A. E. P. *Thanksgiving Sermon.* Boston: T. R. Marvin and Son, 1865.

Pettes, Samuel, Jr., *The Preacher and the Hearer.* Lowell: B. H. Penhallow, 1855.

Post, T. M. *National Regeneration.* St. Louis: Geo. Knapp, 1864.

Quint, Alonzo H. *Southern Chivalry, and What the Nation Ought to Do with It.* New Bedford: Mercury Job Press, 1865.

———. *Annual Election Sermon.* Boston: Wright and Potter, 1866.

Rankin, J. E. *Moses and Joshua.* Boston: Dakin and Metcalf, 1865.

Robinson, Charles S. *The Martyred President.* New York: John F. Trowbridge, 1865.

Robinson, James T. *National Anniversary Address.* North Adams, Massachusetts: W. H. Phillips, 1865.

Salter, William. *Our National Sins and Impending Calamities.* Burlington, Iowa: Hawk-Eye Book Office, 1861.

Seabury, Samuel. *American Slavery.* New York: Mason Bros., 1861.

Simpson, Matthew, and Others. *Our Martyred President Abraham Lincoln: Voices from the Pulpit of New York and Brooklyn.* New York: Tibbals and Whiting, 1865.

Sermon IV	Stephen H. Tyng
Sermon V	Charles S. Robinson
Sermon VI	William Ives Budington
Sermon VII	John McClintock
Sermon X	Joseph P. Thompson
Sermon XV	J. E. Rockwell
Sermon XVI	Samuel T. Spear
Sermon XVII	Robert Lowry
Sermon XVIII	Albert S. Hunt
Sermon XX	Henry J. Fox
Sermon XXI	Henry B. Smith

Burial Oration at Springfield, Ill. Bishop Simpson.

Smith, L. *The Higher Law.* Ravenna, Ohio: Star Print, 1852.

Sturtevant, J. M. *Our Duty to Civil Government.* Hannibal, Missouri: Frazee, Ebert, 1862.

Swain, Leonard. *A Nation's Sorrow.* Providence: Central Congregational Church, 1865.

Sweetser, Seth. *A Commemorative Discourse on the Death of Abraham Lincoln.* Boston: John Wilson and Son, 1865.

Thompson, Joseph P. *Our National Crimes and Follies.* New York: Thos. Holman, 1861.

———. *Peace Through Victory.* New York: Loyal Publication Society, 1864.

———. *Abraham Lincoln, His Life and Its Lessons.* New York: Loyal Publication Society, 1865.

Trumbull, H. C. *Desirableness of Active Service.* Hartford: Case, Lockwood, 1864.

———. *Good News.* Hartford: Case, Lockwood, 1864.

Vincent, Marvin R. *A Sermon on the Assassination of Abraham Lincoln.* Troy: A. W. Scribner, 1865.

Vinton, A. H. *The Mistakes of the Rebellion.* New York: Geo. F. Nesbitt, 1863.

Wentworth, J. B. *A Discourse on the Death of Abraham Lincoln.* Buffalo: Matthews and Warren, 1865.

C. Contemporary Histories and Records

Baird, Robert. *The Progress and Prospects of Christianity in the United States of America.* London: Partridge and Oakley, 1851.

Barnes, Albert. *The Church and Slavery.* Philadelphia: Parry and McMillan, 1856.

McPherson, Edward. *The Political History of the United States of America during the Great Rebellion.* Washington: J. J. Chapman, 1882.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Vol. XII. New York Presbyterian Publication Committee, 1861.

Stanton, R. L. *The Church and the Rebellion.* New York: Derby and Miller, 1864.

D. Newspapers and Magazines

Albany Daily Knickerbocker (New York), 1861.
American Jubilee, (New York), 1854.
American Messenger (New York), 1862.
Beloit Journal and Courier (Wisconsin), 1861-62.
Boston Evening Transcript (Massachusetts), 1861.
Buffalo Commercial Advertiser (New York), 1861, 1863.
Central Christian Herald (Cincinnati, Ohio), 1850-60.
Christian Advocate and Journal (New York), 1857-65.
Christian Chronicle (Philadelphia), 1850.
Christian Inquirer (New York), 1851-64.
Christian Palladium (New York), 1861.
Christian Register (Boston), 1850-54, 1857-65.
Christian Secretary (Hartford), 1862, 1864-65.
Christian Watchman and Reflector (Boston), 1859-60; 1863-64.
Cincinnati Daily Commercial (Ohio), 1864.

Congregational Herald (Chicago), 1853-61.
Courrier Des Etats-Unis (New York), 1863-65.
Daily Commercial Register (Sandusky, Ohio), 1856-57, 1863.
Daily Toledo Blade (Ohio), 1862.
Daily Tribune (Chicago), 1861.
Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register (New York), 1862-64.
Fremont Journal (Ohio), 1861-64.
Friend's Review (Philadelphia), 1855-65.
Herald of Gospel Liberty (Dayton, Ohio), 1854-61; 1863-65. Also the *Gospel Herald,* Yellow Springs, Ohio, and Newburyport, Massachusetts.
New Haven Daily Register (Conn.), 1861.
New Haven Evening Register (Conn.), 1865.
Newport Mercury (Rhode Island), 1861.
New York Baptist and Register (Utica, N. Y.), 1853-55.
New York Observer (New York), 1860, 1862-65.
Northwestern Christian Advocate (Chicago), 1857; 1859-60.
Presbyterian of the West (Cincinnati), 1850-54.
Presbyterian Herald (Louisville, Ky.), 1859-61.
Protestant Churchman (New York), 1860-61.
Quincy Whig Republican (Ill.), 1861.
Radical Abolitionist (New York), 1855-58.
Republican Farmer (Bridgeport, Conn.), 1861.
Salem Gazette (Mass.), 1861.
Springfield Republican (Mass.), 1861.
Springfield Weekly Republican (Mass.), 1865.
The Advocate (Buffalo), 1861.
The American Quarterly Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register (New York), 1861-64.
The Brooklyn Daily Eagle (New York), 1861.
The Calendar (Hartford, Conn.), 1852, 1858, 1861, 1863.
The Christian Examiner (Boston), 1860-65.
The Christian Herald and Presbyterian Recorder (Cincinnati), 1864-65.
The Christian Press (Cincinnati), 1854-63.
The Christian Review (Rochester), 1860-63.
The Churchman (New York), 1860-61.
The Congregationalist (Boston), 1852-53, 1860-65.
The Congregational Quarterly (Boston), 1862.

The Crisis (Columbus, Ohio), 1861.
The Evangelist (New York), 1861-63.
The Evangelical Quarterly Review (Gettysburg, Pa.), 1860-65.
The Evening Post (New York), 1862.
The Friend (Philadelphia), 1850-65.
The Gospel Messenger and Church Record of Western New York (Utica), 1861.
The Herald of Truth (Chicago), 1864.
The Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. (Philadelphia), 1865.
The Home Missionary (New York), 1860-66.
The Independent (New York), 1860-65.
The Liberator (Boston), 1859-61.
The Methodist Quarterly Review (New York), 1861, 1863.
The Millennial Harbinger (Bethany, Va.), 1861.
The New Englander (New Haven, Conn.), 1859.
The Oberlin Evangelist (Ohio), 1857-62.
The Philadelphia Inquirer (Pa.), 1861.
The Presbyter (Cincinnati), 1860.
The Presbyterian (Philadelphia), 1854, 1861, 1863-64.
The Principia (New York), 1859-61.
The Schenectady Daily News (New York), 1861.
The True Presbyterian (Louisville, Ky.), 1862.
The Trumpet and Universalist Magazine (Boston), 1850-57; 1860-65. Also *The Christian Trumpet and Freeman, Trumpet and Christian Freeman, The Universalist*, etc.
The Weekly Perrysburg Journal (Ohio), 1859-65.
The Western Christian Advocate (Cincinnati), 1850-65.
The World (New York), 1861.

II. Secondary Works

Abbott, Lyman. *Henry Ward Beecher.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1903.
Abbott, Lyman, and S. B. Halliday. *Henry Ward Beecher.* Hartford: American Publishing Co., 1887.
Allen, A. V. G. Phillip Brooks. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1907.

Andrews, Rena Mazyck. *Archbishop Hughes and the Civil War.* Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1935, MSS.

Barrett, J. P. *The Centennial of Religious Journalism.* Dayton, Ohio: Christian Publishing Association, 1908.

Barrows, John Henry. *Henry Ward Beecher.* New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1893.

Bassett, John Spencer. *Short History of the United States.* New York: Macmillan, 1918. (For a source quotation.)

Brann, Henry A. *Most Reverend John Hughes.* New York: Dodd, Mead, 1892.

Carus, William. *Memorials of the Right Reverend Charles Pettit McIlvaine, D.D., D.C.L.* New York: Thos. Whittaker, 1882.

Chadwick, John W. *Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1900.

Cole, A. C. *The Irrepressible Conflict, 1850-1865.* New York: Macmillan, 1934.

Coleman, Leighton. *The Church in America.* New York: James Pott & Co., 1895.

Craven, Avery Odell. *Edmund Ruffin, Southerner.* New York: D. Appleton, 1932.

Crooks, George R. *The Life of Bishop Matthew Simpson of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* New York: Harper and Bros., 1891.

Doyle, Henry Grattan. *Catholicism in the Civil War and Reconstruction.* Vol. I of *Catholic Builders of the Nation.* Boston: Continental Press, 1923. Pp. 163-183.

Fortenbaugh, Robert. "The Representative Lutheran Periodical Press and Slavery, 1830-1860," *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Gettysburg, Pa., April, 1935. Pp. 151-172.

———. "American Lutheran Synods and Slavery," *The Journal of Religion.* The University of Chicago Press, XIII (January, 1933), No. 1, Pp. 72-92.

Frothingham, P. R. *Edward Everett: Orator and Statesman.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1925.

Garrison, W. E. *The March of Faith.* New York, Harper and Bros., 1933.

Garrison, W. P., and F. J. *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879.* New York: The Century Co., 1889.

Gillard, John T. *The Catholic Church and the American Negro.* Baltimore: St. Joseph's Society Press, 1929.

Hart, Albert Bushnell. *Slavery and Abolition.* Vol. XVI, "American Nation Series." New York: Harper and Bros., 1906.

Hassard, J. R. G. *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes, D.D.* New York: D. Appleton, 1865.

Heathcote, Charles W. *The Lutheran Church and the Civil War.* Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1919.

Hibben, Paxton. *Henry Ward Beecher.* New York: Geo. F. Doran, 1927.

Hutchinson, William T. *Cyrus Hall McCormick.* Vol. II. New York: Appleton-Century, 1935.

Howard, John R. *Henry Ward Beecher.* New York: Fords, Howard and Hulbert, 1891.

Jacobs, Henry E. *A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States.* New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1893.

Macy, Jesse. *The Anti-Slavery Crusade.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920.

Matlack, L. C. *The Antislavery Struggle and Triumph in the Methodist Episcopal Church.* New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1881.

McMaster, John Bach. *A History of the People of the United States. Vol. V.* New York: D. Appleton, 1900.

Milton, George Fort. *The Eve of Conflict.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1934.

Murphy, Robert Joseph. *The Catholic Church in the United States During the Civil War Period (1852-1866).* Vol. XXXIX, No. 4, Records of the American Catholic Historical Society, Philadelphia, December, 1928. Pp. 271-346.

Nicholay, John G., and Hay, John. *Abraham Lincoln, A History.* 10 vols. New York: The Century Co., 1890.

Perry, William Stevens. *The History of the American Episcopal Church: 1587-1883.* Boston: James R. Osgood, 1885.

Pond, J. B. *Eccentricities of Genius.* London: Chatto and Windus, 1901.

Reed, Thomas B. (Ed.) *Modern Eloquence.* Vol. XII. Philadelphia: John D. Morris, 1903.

Rhodes, James Ford. *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850.* Vols. I, II (1892); V (1904). New York: Macmillan, 1893.

Rourke, Constance Mayfield. *Trumpets of Jubilee.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1927.

Siebert, Wilbur H. *The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom.* 2 vols. New York: Macmillian, 1898.

Smythe, G. F. *A History of the Diocese* (Protestant Episcopal) *. . .of Ohio Until the Year 1918.* Cleveland: Horace Carr, Printer, 1931.

Stowe, Lyman Beecher. *Saints, Sinners and Beechers.* Indianapolis: Bobbs, Merrill, 1934.

Sweet, William Warren. *The Methodist Church and the Civil War.* Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, 1912.

————. *The Story of Religions in America.* New York: Harper and Bros., 1930.

————. *Methodism in American History.* New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1933.

Tiffany, C. C. *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.* New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895.

Velde, Louis G. Vander, *The Presbyterian Church and the Federal Union: 1861-1869.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Walsh, James J. *Our American Cardinals.* New York: D. Appleton, 1926.

Weed, Harriet A. (Ed.) *Thurlow Weed: Autobiography.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1883.

Willey, Austin. *The History of the Antislavery Cause in State and Nation.* Portland, Maine: Brown, Thurston and Hoyt, Fogg, & Donham, 1886.

Wilson, Henry. *The History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America.* 2 vols. Boston: James R. Osgood, 1874.

Libraries and Archives Consulted

Connecticut:

New Haven

1. The Sterling Library of Yale University.
2. The Divinity School Library of Yale University.

Illinois:

Chicago

1. Harper Library of the University of Chicago.
2. The Divinity School Library of the University of Chicago.
3. The Chicago Historical Society Library.
4. The Chicago Public Library.
5. The Newberry Library.
6. The Hammond Library of Chicago Theological Seminary.
7. The Meadville Theological School Library.
8. The Virginia Library of the Presbyterian Seminary of Chicago.

Evanston

1. Garrett Biblical Institute Library.
2. Library of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary.

Michigan:

Ann Arbor

1. The General Library of the University of Michigan.
2. The William Clements Library of the University of Michigan.

New York:

Auburn

1. Auburn Theological Seminary Library.

Buffalo

1. The Grosvenor Library.

New York City

1. The General Theological Seminary Library.
2. Union Theological Seminary Library.

Syracuse

1. The Syracuse University Library.

Ohio:

Cleveland

1. The Public Library of Cleveland.

Cincinnati

1. The Public Library of Cincinnati.

Dayton

1. The Archives of the Christian Publishing Association.

Fremont

1. The Birchard Public Library.
2. The Hayes Memorial Library.

Oberlin

1. The Carnegie Library of Oberlin College.

Perrysburg

1. The Way Public Library.

Sandusky

1. The Sandusky Public Library.
2. Archives of the Daily Commercial Register.

Toledo

1. The Toledo Public Library.
2. The Toledo Teacher's College.
3. Saint John's University (now Saint Francis De Sales).

Wisconsin:

Beloit

1. Beloit College Library.

Material was secured from:

1. The Congregational Library of Boston.
2. Capital University Library of Columbus, Ohio.
3. American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia.
4. Kenyon College Library, Gambier, Ohio.

INDEX

Abbott, the Rev. Lyman, 195, 209-210, 216, 230, 231
Adams, the Rev. Dr., 73
Adams, the Rev. Nehemiah, 104-106
Albany, N. Y., 34, 139
Allen, the Rev. Jos. H., 47
American Peace Society, 43
American Union Commission, 211
Andersonville Prison, 154, 156, 178
Andover, Mass., 81
Anti-Slavery, ideology of, 35-44
Apologists, Northern Clergy, 104-109
Assassination, of Lincoln, 156-159
Atrocity stories, 150-159
Atwood, the Rev. E. S., 175-176
Augusta, Me., 34

Bacon, the Rev. H. W., 137
Bacon, the Rev. Leonard, 58-59, 170-171, 193
Badger, the Rev. Henry C., 173, 203
Bailey, the Rev. Jacob, 41
Baltimore, Md., 14, 17-18
Bangor, Me., 47
Banks, Sen. Nathaniel P., 52
Baptist, slavery schisms of, 27
Barnes, Albert, 5
Barre, Vt., 168
Barrows, the Rev. Wm., 116
Bartholomew, the Rev. J. G., 112
Bartlett, the Rev. Mr., 4
Bartol, the Rev. C. A., 53
Beckwith, Geo., 43
Bedell, Bishop G. T., 116
Beecher, the Rev. Edward, 3
Beecher, the Rev. Henry Ward, 3, 4, 5, 13, 30, 44, 52, 54, 62, 73, 83, 85, 115, 135, 149, 166-167, 182, 209-210, 227-228, 235-236
Beecher, the Rev. Lyman, 2, 44, 53, 83
Bellows, the Rev. Henry W., 84, 135
Beloit, Wis., 41, 133
Bethune, the Rev. Dr., 135
Beverly, Mass., 110
Billerica, Mass., 11
Bingham, the Rev. Joel F., 158
Bittinger, the Rev. J. B., 64
Blackburn, the Rev. Wm., 184
Bliss, the Rev. S. F., 168
Bloomington, Ill., 144
Boardman, the Rev. Geo. D., 183-184, 194
Booth, John Wilkes, 172-177
Booth, the Rev. Robt. R., 186, 193
Boston, Mass., 26, 28, 29, 37, 54, 66, 81, 84, 87, 89, 95, 98, 103, 104, 111 129, 145, 156-157, 181, 182, 197, 199, 211, 232
Brakeman, Chaplain N. L., 97-98
Brantley, the Rev. W. T., 146
Brookline, Mass., 86
Brooklyn, N. Y., 4, 19, 29, 30, 31, 83, 85, 116, 129, 135, 149, 181, 182, 184-185, 201-202, 209-210, 235-236
Brooks, the Rev. A. L., 29
Brooks, the Rev. Phillips, 88, 99-100, 157-158, 187
Brooks, Rep. Preston S., 23, 35
Brown, John, 35, 60-68, 83
Buckingham, the Rev. S. G., 236
Buffalo, N. Y., 11, 81, 158, 168, 181, 185, 187
Bull Run, battle of, 140, 152, 157
Burgess, Bishop G., 53
Burlington, Ia., 132
Bushnell, the Rev. Horace, 53, 54, 82, 139-140
Butler, Gen. B. F., 194
Butler, the Rev. C. M., 157, 174-175
Butler, the Rev. Dr., 149-150
Butler, the Rev. Henry, 186
Butler, the Rev. J. G., 174

Calhoun, Sen. John C., 1-2
Cambridgeport Parish, Mass., 173, 203
Campbell, the Rev. Alexander, 145
Cannon, christening of, 115
Cartwright, the Rev. Peter, 134
Caste, Southern Social Order of, 89-95
Castleton, N. Y., 74
Causes of war, 126-134; Clergy, North and South, 126-129; Northern Abolition and Anti-Slavery Leaders, 129-130; Demagogues, Politicians, and Public Sentiment, 130-132; Providential Discipline and Punishment, 132-134
Chaplains, work of, 140; Chaplain N. L. Brakeman, 97-98; Chaplain A. H. Conant, 115-116; Chaplain

Inskip, 140; Chaplain Jameson, 115; Chaplain I. F. Jones, 140; Chaplain McFarland, 156; "Chaplain" Moody, 141; Chaplain Mooney, 115; Chaplain H. H. Moore, 207, 225-226; Chaplain A. H. Quint, 152; Chaplain H. C. Trumbull, 141; Chaplain Woodbury, 140-141
Charlestown, Mass., 185-186
Charleston, S. C., 87, 103, 166, 209-210, 227-228
Castleton, N. Y., 74
Cheever, the Rev. Geo. B., 4, 30-31
Cheever, the Rev. Henry, 42
Chelsea, Mass., 133
Christianity, and war, 110-118
Chicago, 26, 35, 39, 63-64, 81, 132-133, 136-137, 211
Chrishasan Landing, Ala., 156
Cincinnati, O., 4, 15, 26, 34, 37, 81, 114, 128, 163-164, 211
Civilizations, divergent, 81-89
Clark, Bishop T. M., 112
Clay, Sen. Henry, 2, 27-28, 34
Clerical influence, 1-10; protests, 21-22, 29, 51-54, 56
Coffin, Charles, 146
Coleman, Bishop Leighton, 20
Collyer, the Rev. Robt., 3, 136
Columbia, S. C., 105
Columbus, O., 3
Conant, Chaplain A. H., 115-116
Conciliation, of South, 165-172
Concord, N. H., 46
Condemnation, of South, 165-172
Constitution, of the U. S., 159, 160, 161
Coombe, the Rev. P., 114, 128
Copperheadism, see disloyalty
Corning, the Rev. J. L., 136, 137
Cortland, N. Y., 103
Cowles, the Rev. Henry, 64
Crane, the Rev. Dr., 162
Craven, Avery O., 131-132
Creedon, the Rev. Father, 139
Cuyler, the Rev. Theodore, 4, 116

Danville, Ky., 126
Davis, Jefferson, 146, 177-180, 203
Day, the Rev. P. B., 176-177
Dewey, the Rev. Mr., 33
Disloyalty, of Northern Clergy, 143-150
Dorchester, Mass., 11, 36, 78, 81, 86
Douglas, Sen. Stephen A., 12-13, 21-22, 34, 35, 37, 41, 48, 51, 54-55, 56, 69
Dred Scott Decision, 35, 57-60, 83
Dunn, the Rev. Jacob, 162
Dwight, the Rev. Wm. T., 12
Eagleville, Ind., 146
Eddy, the Rev. Daniel C., 87-88, 156-157, 197
Eddy, the Rev. Richard, 179, 190
Eddy, the Rev. T. M., 136
Eddy, the Rev. Zachary, 161
Edgar County, Ill., 139, 147
Edwards, the Rev. Henry L., 172, 226
Elizabethtown, Ky., 115
Emerson, the Rev. Ralph Waldo, 46, 66-67
Eustis, the Rev. Mr., 170-171, 192-193
Everett, the Rev. Edward (Senator), 47, 51, 52, 53-54
Everts, the Rev. Dr., 136
Ewer, the Rev. F. C., 113
Fairchild, the Rev. Jas. G., 65
Fee, the Rev. J. G., 37
Finney, the Rev. Charles G., 2
Fish ,the Rev. W. H., 103
Fitzwilliam, N. H., 116
Foster, the Rev. Dr., 78
Foster, the Rev. Eden B., 38, 54-55, 89-90, 95
Foster, the Rev. Edwin B., 153-154, 163
Fort Pillow, 154, 156
Fort Sumter, 85, 135, 137, 166, 167, 183, 227
Fox, the Rev. Henry J., 189
Franklin, Ind., 128
Franklin, Tenn., 156
Friends (Quaker), 32, 43, 50-51, 59-60, 62, 65, 74, 117-118, 137
Frothingham, the Rev. Frederick, 64
Fugitive Slave Act (1850), 21, 27-34, 35, 36
Fuller, the Rev. Dr., 125-126
Fulton, the Rev. Justin D., 182
Funk, the Rev. J. F., 118
Furness, the Rev. Wm. H., 30
Gannett, the Rev. Ezra S., 37
Garrison, the Rev. W. E., 7
Garrison, William Lloyd, 61
Gallaudet, the Rev. Dr., 73
Gaylord, the Rev. Wm. L., 116
George, the Rev. A. C., 222, 224-225
Gibbons, the Rev. Father James, 17
Gladden, the Rev. Washington, 3-4, 71, 169-170
Goodwin, the Rev. H. M., 174
Greeley, Horace, 142
Greencastle, Ind., 139
Guilt, of war, 165-196
Guion, the Rev. Thos. T., 19

Gurley, the Rev. P. D., 158-159

Hagancy, the Rev. J. B., 112-113
Hague, the Rev. Dr., 113
Hale, the Rev. Edward Everett, 3, 86, 102-103
Hall, the Rev. Nathaniel, 11, 36, 78, 86-87
Harper's Ferry, 23, 35, 60-68
Harrisburg, Pa., 190
Hartford, Conn., 54, 81, 82, 139-140
Hartzell, the Rev. J. H., 168
Haven, the Rev. E. O., 232
Haven, the Rev. Gilbert, 181, 199, 222-223
Haverstraw. N. Y., 162
Henry, the Rev. C. S., 78-79
Hertz, E., 166
Higher Law, idea of, 39
Hitchcock, Pres. Edward, 53
Hoge, the Rev. Mr., 145, 195
Hollis, N. H., 176-177
Holmes, the Rev. J. M., 211
Hopkins, Bishop J. H., 20, 106-108
Hopkins, Pres. Mark, 53
House Divided, idea of, 36, 38
Howlett, the Rev. T. R., 177
Hughes, Archbishop John, 15, 16-17
Humphrey, the Rev. Dr., 130
Humphrey, the Rev. S. J., 133
Humphrey, the Rev. Z. M., 136-137
Hunt, the Rev. Albert, 189

Ideology, of anti-slavery conviction, 35-44
Inskip, Chaplain, 140

Jackson, Gen. (Stonewall), 183, 210
Jameson, Chaplain, 115
Jersey City, N. J., 211
Johnson, President Andrew, 235-236
Johnston, the Rev. E. S., 190
Jones, Chaplain I. F., 140
Joy, the Rev. Jos. E., 215-216

Kansas-Nebraska Act, 11, 12-13, 21-22, 35, 37, 48-57, 89
Keeseville, N. Y., 186
Kennard, the Rev. Mr., 135
Kimball, the Rev. Mr., 110
Knowlton, the Rev. I. C., 232
Know Nothing Party, 39
Lancaster, Pa., 24, 25
Laurie, the Rev. Thos., 196
Law, the Higher, 39-40
Lawrence, Mass., 199
Lee, General Robert E., 156-157, 166, 180-183, 203, 210
Libby Prison, 152-153, 154, 156, 178
Lincoln, President Abraham, 44, 87, 156-159, 163, 167, 179, 184, 189, 203
Lowell, Mass., 38, 54, 89-90, 95
Lowry, the Rev. Robt., 188
Loyalty, of Northern Clergy, 134-143
Lutheran Church, war Attitude of, 21-26
Lyceum Lecturer, influence of, 2-3
Lynd, the Rev. S. W., 114
Lynnfield, Mass., 133

Macgown, the Rev. G. F., 75
McFarland, Chaplain A., 156
McIlvaine, Bishop C. P., 19, 162-163
McPherson. Edward, 128-129
Maxwell, the Rev. J. G., 135
Mennonites, 117, 118
Methodist Episcopal Church, schisms, 27
Middletown, Conn., 117
Milton, Mass., 75
Moody, the Rev. Granville, 128
Moody, "Fighting Parson," 141
Mooney, Chaplain, 115
Moore, Chaplain H. H., 207, 225-226
Morals, Southern, 92, 95-96, 97-98
Morison, the Rev. J. H., 75
Morrisania, N. Y., 3-4, 71, 169-170
Mount Auburn, O., 114
Murdock, the Rev. J. N., 86

Nashville, Tenn., 209-210
Negro Missions, 224-229
New Bedford, Mass., 94, 138, 197-198, 206, 227
Newburgh, N. Y., 78-79
New Haven, Conn., 59, 137-138, 170-172, 192-193
New Orleans, La., 17, 209-210
New York City, N. Y., 15, 16, 26, 29, 30, 72-73, 77, 81, 84, 96, 98, 106, 112-113, 135-136, 145-146. 153, 155, 162, 186, 187, 188-189, 195, 201, 207-208, 211
Niagara County, N. Y., 138
Neutral Preachers, see disloyalty
North Adams, Mass., 88
Northern Clergy, disloyalty of, 143-150; influence of, 1-6; loyalty of, 134-143; pro-Southern, 104-109
Northern Religious Press, influence of, 1-6
Northwest Ordinance of 1787, 49

Oberlin, O., 44, 64-65
O'Brien, the Rev. E. J., 137-138

Ottumwa, Ia., 142

Paddock, the Rev. Wilbur F., 173
Palmer, the Rev. Dr., 195
Paris, Ill., 147
Parker, the Rev. Theodore, 2-3, 4, 28-29, 38, 53, 54, 61, 67, 81-82
Patterson, the Rev. Dr., 136
Patton, the Rev. Dr., 171-172
Patton, the Rev. A. S., 176
Patton, the Rev. W. W., 63-64, 136
Peace, efforts of, 43; and Secession, 71-76
Peace Terms, 196-203
Pekin, Ill., 138
Perkins, the Rev. A. E. P., 190
Pettes, the Rev. Samuel, Jr., 11
Phelps, the Rev. Austin, 84
Philadelphia, Pa., 26, 29, 30, 81, 88, 99-100, 106, 135-136, 145-146, 157-158, 173, 174-175, 179, 183-184, 187, 190, 193, 194
Philips, the Rev. W. S., 97
Pickman, the Rev. W. R., 113
Pilgrims and Puritans, 30, 39, 83, 88, 180
Pittsfield, Mass., 33, 130
Plans of Spiritual Regeneration, 212-219; of Annihilation, 212-214; of Supplementation, 214-217; of Cooperation, 217-219
Pleasantville, O., 162
Plumb, the Rev. Albert, 133
Poisal, the Rev. J., 145-146
Politics and Religion, 10-27
Polk, Bishop Leonidas, 101
Pond, Maj. J. B., 2-3, 4
Poor Whites, 92-93, 229-231
Portland, Me., 12
Portsmouth, N. H., 6
Post, the Rev. T. M., 233
Potter, Bishop Alonzo, 106-108
Potter, Bishop Horatio, 20, 72
Pratt, the Rev. Horace, 74
Presbyterians, divisions of, 27
Projected Programs, for a New South, 219, 232; Occupation of White Christendom, 219-223; A Field for Negro Missions, 224-229; Work among the Poor Whites, 229-231; Northern Churches for Northern Emigrants, 231; Northern Prophets of Idealism and Realism, 232-237
Protestant Episcopal Church, war attitude of, 18-21
Providence, R. I., 168, 172-173, 193
Prudden, the Rev. Geo. P., 67
Putnam, the Rev. Geo., 75

Quinby, the Rev. G. W., 117
Quint, the Rev. Alonzo (See Quintus), 89, 94, 152, 197-198, 206, 227
Quintus (See Quint), 92-94, 229-230

Rankin, the Rev. J. E., 185
Reading, Mass., 116
Reconstruction, of South, 204-237
Religion and Politics, 10-27
Religious Reconstruction of South, need of, 204-212
Reynolds, the Rev. E. W., 11-12
Rhodes, Jas. Ford, 8-9
Richmond, Va., 41, 104, 152, 154, 165-166, 209-210
Ridgley, the Rev. Vincent, 139
Robinson, the Rev. Chas. S., 184-185
Robinson, the Rev. E. G., 138
Robinson, Jas. T., 88
Rochester, N. Y., 138
Rockford, Ill., 174
Rockwell, the Rev. J. E., 188-189
Roman Catholic Church, war attitude of, 14-18
Roxbury, Mass., 75, 112
Ryder, the Rev. W. H., 137

St. Clair, Butler County, O., 150
St. Helena Island, S. C., 97
St. Louis, Mo., 211, 222, 233
Salem, Mass., 66, 113, 175-176
Salter, the Rev. Wm., 132, 142
Sandusky, O., 11, 41
San Francisco, Cal., 146
Savannah, Ga., 105, 209-210
Sawyer, the Rev. W. W., 138
Scott, General Winfield, 180
Scott, the Rev. Dr., 146
Seabury, the Rev. Samuel, 106
Secession, 68-80; the ballot, 68-71; peace, 71-76; coercion, 76-80
Simpson, Bishop Matthew, 3, 4-5, 114-115, 188-189
Slavocracy, of South, 95-100
Smith, the Rev. Henry B., 153, 189, 202
Smith, the Rev. Wesley, 79
So. Abingdon, Mass., 172, 226
South, the Clergy of, 194-196; leaders of, 183-191; masses, 191-194; morals, 95-96; 97-98; religion, 100-104; way of life, 81-109; women, 93-94
Spaulding, Bishop, 15-16
Spear, the Rev. Samuel T., 30, 79, 91, 96, 162, 181, 201-202
Sprague, Governor, 151

Spring, the Rev. Gardiner S., 145
Springfield, Ill., 4, 189-190
Springfield, Mass., 29, 236
Squatter Sovereignty, 35, 48-57
Stanton, Prof. R. L., 126-127, 140-141, 143-144
Stanton, Secy. E. M., 219, 220-221
Stephens, Alexander H., 187
Stone, the Rev. A. L., 111
Stoneham, Mass., 133
Stork, the Rev. T., 25
Storrs, the Rev. R. S., 4, 30
Stowe, Harriet Beecher, 44-45, 52, 83
Strobel, the Rev. Mr., 135
Strong, the Rev. Mr., 132
Studley, the Rev. Mr., 138
Sumner-Brooks incident, 23, 35, 46-47
Supreme Court, of U. S., 57-60
Swain, the Rev. Leonard, 168, 172-173, 193
Sweetser, the Rev. Seth, 168-169
Swift, the Rev. Warren, 138
Sword, Ministerial gift of, 115
Syracuse, N. Y., 29

Taylor, the Rev. Dr., 135
Taylor, the Rev. Father, 145
Taylor, the Rev. George, 223
Thome, the Rev. Jas. A., 65
Thompson, the Rev. Dr., 163-164
Thompson, the Rev. Jos. P., 4. 30, 77, 96, 135, 188, 201, 207-208, 211
Thurston, the Rev. R. B., 112
Trenton, N. J., 184
Troy, N. Y., 186
Trumbull, Chaplain H. C., 141
Trumbull, the Rev. T. B., 95, 111, 129
Turner, the Rev. T. B., 95, 111, 129
Tuttle, H. P., 146-147
Tyng, the Rev. Stephen G., 73, 187-188

Uncle Tom's Cabin, 35, 44-46
Underground Railroad, 29, 40
Unity, Congregational, 27; Friend, 27; Lutheran, 27; Protestant Episcopal, 27; Roman Catholic, 27; Unitarian, 27; Universalist, 27
Utica, N. Y., 176
Utica, O., 138
Van Dyke, the Rev. Henry J., 129, 149
Vincent, the Rev. Marvin R., 186
Vinton, the Rev. Alexander H., 98-99

Wait, O. J., 90-91
Waltham, Mass., 112
War, causes of, 126, 134; and Christianity, 110-118; guilt, 165-196; objectives of Northern Clergy, 159-164; positions of denominations, 118-126; Baptist, 118-119; Congregational, 119; Free Methodist, 119-120; Friend (Quaker), 120; German Reformed, 120-121; Lutheran, 121; Methodist Episcopal, 122, Methodist Protestant, 121-122; Moravian, 122-123; Presbyterian (New School), 123; Presbyterian (Old School), 123; Protestant Episcopal, 123-124; Reformed Protestant Dutch, 124; Roman Catholic, 124-125; Unitarian, 125; United Brethren in Christ, 125; United Presbyterian, 125-126; Universalist, 126
Ware, Mass., 190-191
Washington, D. C., 148-149, 158-159, 174, 177
Washington, President George, 146
Waterbury, Conn., 67
Weaver, the Rev. G. S., 199
Webster, Senator Daniel, 34
Welles, the Rev. T. D., 135
Wentworth, the Rev. J. B., 181, 185, 187
West Philadelphia, Pa., 144
West Roxbury, Mass., 196
West Springfield, Mass., 153-154, 163
Wethersfield, Conn., 97
Wheatley, the Rev. R., 219
Wheeling, (West Va.), 79
Whitcomb, the Rev. W. C., 133
White Trash, 92-93
Wilder, Sidney, 37
Williams, the Rev. Dr., 113
Winchester, Va., 152
Wise, the Rev. Henry A., Jr., 144
Wood, Bishop, 135
Woodbury, Chaplain, 140-141
Woolsey, Pres. T. D., 53
Worcester, Mass., 168
Wyant, the Rev. W. O., 139

Yarnell, the Rev. Mr., 147-148

DATE DUE

JAN 16 1996
DEC 2 1995
AUG 7 2000
MAY 10 2000
JUN 13 2004
FEB 17 2009

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A.

2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.

E
540
C5D8
1974

345894

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

GTU Library
E540.C5 D8 1974
Dunham, Chester For/The attitude of the
G
3 2400 00082 1946